UNITED SEMINARY - TWIN CITIES
MAIN BD21 H6
Hocking, Wil Types of philosophy,
3 0501 0001 7963 1

29-20237

BD
21
H6

Hocking, William E.

Types of philosophy

BD
21
H6

AUTHOR

Hocking, William E.

TITLE

Types of philosophy.

DATE DUE	BORROWER'S NAME

LIBRARY
UNITED THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
of the
Twin Cities

Chas. H. Dater
4221 Hamilton Ave.
University of Cincinnati

10-29

2.25 new.

Date Due

SE 28 '64			

Demco 293-5

TYPES OF PHILOSOPHY

Library
United Theological Seminary
of the Twin Cities

Presented by

E. A. Katterhenry

TYPES OF PHILOSOPHY

BY

WILLIAM ERNEST HOCKING

ALFORD PROFESSOR OF PHILOSOPHY
AT HARVARD UNIVERSITY

LIBRARY
UNITED THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
of the
Twin Cities

CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS

NEW YORK CHICAGO BOSTON ATLANTA
SAN FRANCISCO DALLAS

COPYRIGHT, 1929, BY
CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS

Printed in the United States of America
C

TO
THREE
YOUNG PHILOSOPHERS
H
R J
H

PREFACE

There are three serviceable ways of beginning the deliberate study of philosophy. First by reading the history of the subject. If one lights by good fortune upon the right guide to this great story, he discovers thought in its living context of biography and social change, and his own concern for truth is deepened by association with the motives which animated the heroes of human speculation. This way has its dangers; they arise chiefly from the plenitude of genius which has been poured into philosophy during two thousand years of reflection. There is a multitude, a growing multitude, of thinkers worthy of consideration. The mind becomes fatigued by its riches; and may gain the paradoxical impression of futility. It is hard for the beginner, especially if he reads dutifully, to take history in the right way: not as an obligation to know all that wise men have thought —no one achieves this—but as an opportunity to make a few durable and important intellectual companionships. If five out of forty great names light up with a personal allurement, one has found *his* friends among the philosophers, and his reading of history has been a success. The likelihood that an American student will achieve this is increased, I believe, if history is his second course rather than his first.

The second way is by direct attack upon the problems of philosophy: what is the mind? how is it related to the body? is the behavior of human beings a part of the machinery of nature? is there a soul? does it survive death? what are these qualities we call good and evil? what have we to do about it? how much, if anything, can we know beyond what we call science? The answers to these and other such questions constitute a man's philosophy: these are the things he wants to know.

Why not plunge directly into these questions, with the best light to-day available, instead of approaching them indirectly through the long tale of the thoughts of other men in other ages? Such, I think, is the mood of the greater number of our scientifically-minded young people. Impatience and good courage mingle in it; and I believe in taking advantage of the courage while it is strong. The taste for history will come with the discovery that philosophy is a racial enterprise, that each one needs Plato's insight to complete his own, and that no one else can report or epitomize what Plato has to say to *him*.

The third way, our present way, is a union of both the historical and the systematic interest. By selecting certain types of world-view that recur in the history of thought, the appalling multiplicity of systems is reduced. One's primary interest is in the validity of the world-view, not in its historic rôle; we are, in fact, attacking the problems of

philosophy for their own sakes. At the same time, we are becoming acquainted with representative thinkers; and under conditions which are, at least in one respect, more favorable than in the historical series. For we meet them when our own concern with a given philosophic problem is at its height, and their thought may most readily come to the aid of our own. It is hard, in an historical course, to get up steam on the problem, let us say of free will, as many times as there are philosophers who have had something to say on it. We have that, in general, to do but once.

The chief advantage, however, is this: that for the great majority of our people, who are not devoting their lives to the study of philosophy, this way seems best adapted to pick up their thoughts helpfully where they are. Our heads, as readers and listeners, are full of fragments of philosophy, hailing from every quarter. Every instructor, whatever his subject, conveys a philosophy; the teaching of English, of history, of economics, of science is at the same time a teaching of philosophy, if only because the instructor is a man and cannot help communicating himself *via* his subject. Likewise our editors, our novelists, our preachers and priests, our poets and playwrights, our politicians and men of business, are consciously or unconsciously injecting streams of philosophy into our mental veins. Our unrescued state is one of philosophic confusion: the theories

we thus absorb in fragments do not agree. The first step toward sanity is an ability to recognize a proposed view or belief for what it is, and for what it leads to. It is the work of the Types to give us the necessary means first of self-defense,—and then of self-possession, the discovery of our own affinities in the world of thought and, at the best, the solution of some of our restless questionings.

This way has the disadvantage of all combinings. We shall have less of history than the historian, and less of system than the systematic enquirer. Only your own presiding genius can tell you whether this way is the way best fitted for your needs.

*
* *

This document, intended in the first place for those who are beginning the study of philosophy under my charge, emerging as it is from the stage of the syllabus and not quite out of the shell, is distinctly informal and disproportionate, with much of the disorder of the workshop about it. I print it in this condition partly because I must do it this way or not at all; partly because its roughness is like a corduroy road, a foe to the somnolence often induced by smooth writing; partly because it aims to be provocative rather than satisfying,—less a settlement than a mountain camp from which one makes excursions into the higher trails.

Though professedly a work for beginners, it is

not on that account useless, I believe, for those more versed in philosophy. There is an argument in the sequence of the Types which can best be appraised by an initiate. And further, in philosophy, while we may get beyond the rudiments, we never leave them behind. The "first principles" of reality and of the art of living are the whole of our business: the latest researches and the deepest of contemporary insights do but contribute their increment to these eternal beginnings of wisdom.

*
* *

It is a pleasure to acknowledge my indebtedness for many a suggestion toward clarity and teachableness to Miss Georgia Harkness, Professor of Philosophy at Elmira, who collaborated with me when the course was first given at Radcliffe College. To Dr. J. W. Miller and to Mr. George Morgan, assisting me at Harvard, I owe numerous improvements in thought and expression, especially in the chapters on realism. The somewhat undue elaboration of these chapters is a consequence of the instructive intricacy of the neo-realistic movement, and the dispersed condition of its sources. Beginners if they plunge into it must be helped through with it.

WILLIAM ERNEST HOCKING.

CONTENTS

PART I. TYPES OF METAPHYSICS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	What Philosophy Is	3
II.	The Original Form of Philosophy: Spiritualism	25

TYPE I. NATURALISM

III.	The Naturalistic View of the World	43
IV.	The Logic of Naturalism	74
V.	Naturalistic Ethics	83
VI.	Naturalism Examined	88
VII.	The Newer Teleology	107

PART II. THEORIES OF KNOWLEDGE

VIII.	Distrust of Reason: Scepticism	121

TYPE II. PRAGMATISM

IX.	What Pragmatism Is	141
X.	Pragmatism Examined	160

TYPE III. INTUITIONISM

XI.	Feeling as an Organ of Knowledge	175
XII.	The Appeal to Intuition	182
XIII.	Bergson	188
XIV.	Intuitionism Examined	195
XV.	Estimate of Intuitionism	203

PART III. TYPES OF METAPHYSICS AND EPISTEMOLOGY

TYPE IV. DUALISM

CHAPTER		PAGE
XVI.	Dualism	215
XVII.	Dualism Examined	223
XVIII.	Cosmic Dualism	237

TYPE V. IDEALISM

XIX.	What Idealism Is	247
XX.	The Intuitions of Idealism	251
XXI.	Berkeley	255
XXII.	Subjective Idealism	262
XXIII.	Objective Idealism	273
XXIV.	Why Nature Exists	283
XXV.	Applications of Idealism	293
XXVI.	Idealism and Ethics	298

TYPE VI. REALISM

XXVII.	Realism	325
XXVIII.	Neo-Realism	336
XXIX.	Realism Examined	356

TYPE VII. MYSTICISM

XXX.	Mysticism	379
XXXI.	Theoretical Mysticism	390
XXXII.	Practical Mysticism	399
XXXIII.	Mysticism Examined	415

PART IV. SYNTHESIS OF THE TYPES

CHAPTER		PAGE
XXXIV.	The Structure of a Philosophy	425
XXXV.	Confessio Fidei	436
	Index of Names	453
	Index of Subjects	457

PART I

TYPES OF METAPHYSICS

Chapter I

WHAT PHILOSOPHY IS

1. When in the vernacular we speak of a man's philosophy we mean simply the *sum of his beliefs*. In this sense, everybody or at least every mature person, necessarily has a philosophy, because nobody can manage a life without an equipment of beliefs.

We are speaking of 'beliefs' now in the wide sense in which belief includes all those views about the world by which a man actually guides his actions. They need not necessarily be *debatable* opinions. A physician does not ordinarily debate nor try to prove that life is worth preserving: it is the belief he is living by, and he may take it for granted as a nearly self-evident truth. On the other hand, he may believe in the politics of the Liberal Party, or that the new school of painting is an inartistic outrage, while recognizing that his views are highly controversial. We mean by a man's beliefs all those judgments, from certainties or convictions at one extreme to mere impressions at the other, upon which he customarily acts. Beliefs are the opinions a man lives by, as distinct from those he merely entertains: in this sense they

constitute his philosophy. And in this sense we can understand Chesterton's remark that "the most practical and important thing about a man is his view of the universe,"—his philosophy. The employee is at the mercy of the philosophy of his employer; and the employer stakes his business on the philosophy of his employees,—do they believe in doing an honest job, inspection or no inspection?

2. When we speak of philosophy as a science, however, we mean the *examination of belief*,—thinking one's way to a well-grounded set of beliefs.

And we refer, in general, to those beliefs which have the widest scope: such beliefs as enter into a religious creed (existence or non-existence of God, immortality or extinction of the self at death), a code of right and wrong (the Ten Commandments, lawyer's code of ethics, what constitutes fair competition), political convictions (democracy or benevolent dictatorship, equality or inequality of men, races and nations), the most general scientific principles (evolution, uniformity of nature, conservation of energy).

Thus philosophy differs from the special sciences in its range. Each science deals with a portion of the field of knowledge; philosophy attempts to frame a picture of the whole,—to establish a world-view, a *Weltanschauung*. Herbert

Spencer proposes to define science as partially unified knowledge, philosophy as completely unified knowledge.* Does the name philosophy savor somewhat of pretentiousness, as of a science beyond science?

There is no doubt that this color, let us say of high mental ambition, adheres to the ordinary connotation of the word philosophy: the name 'philosopher' in a special sense has been reserved for a few outstanding intellects among men. Plato and Aristotle themselves had to meet the criticism that they were aiming at a type of knowledge reserved for the gods. Their reply was in effect that they were *merely philosophers*, that is, in the literal sense, 'lovers of wisdom'; to which Aristotle added this reflection, that the human reason is a divine element in man; in justice to ourselves we cannot do less than live as if whole-knowledge were our rightful portion. There is nothing peculiarly overweening in seeking knowledge of the whole of things: it is not presumptuous for the artist to outline the whole of his picture before putting in the details,—it is not a matter of choice but of necessity if the labor is not to run wild that some sense of the whole should accompany all of it. The whole is commonly sketched-in roughly and is held subject to change as the picture develops: philosophy likewise may have to be content with approximate answers, or as

* First Principles, part II, ch. i.

some have thought (though here I enter a caveat*) with purely hypothetical answers, subject to constant revision. But some sense of the whole we inevitably carry with us. Undertake to answer the simple question, Where are you? and you find that it involves some notion of the whole universe in space. (Try it.) Philosophy is not the peculiar business of the gods, nor of the specially endowed: it is human business; it is everyman's business.

Beliefs about the world as a whole, then, we must have; but can we reduce them, by logical examination, to a theoretical form without presuming too much upon our mental capacity?

3. We do not commonly acquire our major beliefs by a process of reasoning. They come to us first by way of authority or suggestion, the authority of parents and teachers, the suggestion of admired persons whose views are absorbed by the hero-worshipping mind of childhood, or of the social environment, especially of those more intimate groups whose views are simply accepted or taken over because they are the current and approved ways of looking at things in those groups or sets. Beliefs so gained and held without further examination may be called *prejudices*, not in the derogatory but in the literal sense of the word.

Literature and the drama are common and powerful sources of belief. The romance or the play

* On this point, see the concluding chapter.

conveys a silent invitation to accept a creed subtly recommended by the author through his characters.

All conversation tends to transmit philosophy, since no one can express an idea without conveying, if only by a flick of the eye or a gesture, something of his general temper and outlook, his optimism or pessimism, his belief in intangibles or his hard-headed practicality, his self-centred disdain or his liberal sympathy. And this process when it becomes that conversation between one generation and another which we call "tradition," from which every one selects what appeals to him as valid or fit, is the chief original source of belief in the form of prejudice.

4. There is something to be said in behalf of prejudice, as against the proposal of philosophic science that belief should be examined.

Digging around the roots of our beliefs in order to get reasons for them, good or bad, may kill a good healthy belief. Or, it may be simply a way of deceiving ourselves into the notion that we have "proved" or "established" a doctrine which we are really holding because it suits us to do so, —"rationalizing" our prejudices. "Metaphysics is the finding of bad reasons for what we believe on instinct," said F. H. Bradley;* adding the remark that "the finding of those reasons is none

* Appearance and Reality, p. xiv.

the less an instinct." Argumentation everybody instinctively distrusts; the reasons for our beliefs are commonly weaker, and less important, than the beliefs themselves. Hence we may refute all the reasons alleged for a belief without refuting the belief, or shaking the conviction of its holder.

Edmund Burke, appalled by the excesses of the French Revolution committed in the name of Reason, praised prejudice as the normal support of "the spirit of a gentleman and the spirit of religion" which, he thinks, have made the civilization of England.

"In this enlightened age I am bold enough to confess that we are generally men of untaught feelings; that instead of casting away all our old prejudices, we cherish them to a very considerable degree, and, to take more shame to ourselves, we cherish them because they are prejudices; and the longer they have lasted, and the more generally they have prevailed, the more we cherish them. We are afraid to put men to live and trade each on his own private stock of reason; because we suspect that this stock in each man is small, and that the individuals would do better to avail themselves of the general bank and capital of nations and of ages. Many of our men of speculation, instead of exploding general prejudices, employ their sagacity to discover the latent wisdom which prevails in them. If they find what they seek, and they seldom fail, they think it more wise to con-

tinue the prejudice, with the reason involved, than to cast away the coat of prejudice, and to leave nothing but the naked reason; because prejudice, with its reason, has a motive to give action to that reason, and an affection which will give it permanence. Prejudice is of ready application in the emergency; it previously engages the mind in a steady course of wisdom and virtue, and does not leave the man hesitating in the moment of decision, sceptical, puzzled and unresolved. Prejudice renders a man's virtue his habit; and not a series of unconnected acts. Through just prejudice, his duty becomes a part of his nature."*

5. But let us be clear what philosophy proposes to do. It does not necessarily insist that every belief must be established by reason. It does not assert that we have no right to believe what we cannot prove. What it does is to inquire what the grounds are on which beliefs are held and *what grounds are good grounds.* It may find a normal place for prejudice, distinguishing justifiable from unjustifiable prejudice. It may, in some cases, sanction authority as a ground for belief, aiding us to discriminate between a good authority and a bad one. It may advise us, in other cases, to rely on intuition, offering some way of telling a true intuition from a false one. A large part of its business is to inquire what reason can

* Reflections on the Revolution in France, middle.

do, and what it cannot do, in the way of supporting belief. This will be a part of our own study (§ 8 below and Chs. VIII–XV). But in any case it holds that we cannot, as human beings, remain satisfied with dumb tenacity in holding our beliefs. So long as false beliefs are possible, and such false beliefs in vital matters are perilous luxuries, there can be no virtue in declining to *think* about the foundations of belief.

The idea that philosophy is presumptuous can only mean that it is too ambitious a thing to try living intelligently in so vast a universe; and that it is somehow more modest to go it blind! Surely it is extravagant to imagine that the capacity for thinking is an inherent vice. We cannot, even if we would, prevent ourselves from thinking about the frame and principles and destiny of our lives; and we believe that the right use of reason brings us nearer truth, not farther away from it. Thus philosophy itself may be said to be founded upon a belief, a belief expressed long ago by Socrates, that "the unexamined life is not worth living, by a man."*

THE VARIOUS BELIEFS WITH WHICH PHILOSOPHY IS ESPECIALLY CONCERNED

6. *Beliefs about reality:* the theme of metaphysics.

It is a large part of the ordinary business of

* Plato, Apology 37.

life to distinguish between "appearances" and the true state of the case,—the "reality." If it is a matter of life and death for the fox to penetrate the cunning deceptions devised for him by the hunter, it is none the less vital for man to know when he is dealing with reality, and when with a mere semblance of reality. There is presumably no cosmic hunter intentionally luring him into traps; it is chiefly in the shams and fair showings which cover social hostilities and greeds that he gains his abundant experience in distinguishing the real from the unreal. Yet nature herself presents many a misleading appearance,—the fixity of the stars, the stable quiescence of the earth, the 'firmament' of the sky, and a thousand others. The stick appears bent in the water; in 'reality' it is straight. A piece of wood or metal appears solid substance; in 'reality' it may be a shimmering dance of molecules, separated by proportionately vast spaces, while they in turn are composed of elements devoid of every vestige of tangible solidity. It is the business of experience and of physical science to find the realities which such appearances conceal.

But the physical world itself: is that as final and substantial as it seems? Death appears to be the end of the human personality: is that true? We seem to ourselves to be free agents: are we? The world appears to be an assemblage of many things of many kinds: is this the case, or are all things manifestations of a single hidden being?

The search for reality here is the business of metaphysics. Reality is the ensemble of things as they are, after all error and illusion have been corrected. In one aspect, reality is called 'substance,' the underlying or original stuff whose various modifications explain the appearances of things.

There are two kinds of thing which we are likely to take as undoubtedly real. We take physical objects to be real, and we take states of mind to be real. We might say, anything is real if it is as real as a rock, or as real as a pain. Sometimes the rock appears to be more certainly real. Sometimes it appears easier to doubt the existence of the rocks themselves than to doubt the reality of the pain.

But there may be moments when it seems to us that the physical reality is the only true substance, and that the mental appearances can be explained by it. Or, it may seem that the mental reality is sufficient to account for the physical appearances: that the mind alone is genuinely real. The history of thought has been very largely controlled by the fact that to some men the rock is the impressive and sufficient type of reality, to others the feeling or 'the mind.' The former tend to become materialists, or *naturalists*, the latter tend to become *idealists*. To the former, mind is an appearance of physical reality; to the latter, nature is an appearance of mental reality. If we consider that whatever is metaphysically real necessarily

endures, while the appearances are subject to change or to dis-appearance, the difference will not appear unimportant.

There are other logically possible alternatives. Mind and physical nature may be manifestations of some third substance which is neither the one nor the other. Or there may be two kinds of reality, the material and the mental—eternally distinct and irreducible—the belief of *dualism*. Are there still other alternatives?

Even though there were nothing to be done about it, one could hardly be accused of idle curiosity if he were concerned to reach an answer to such questions as these about the character of reality. There is a natural interest, not to say piety, in looking toward the origins of our own lives and of the rest of the life and consciousness in nature; there is a natural concern in looking toward the ultimate destiny of all this living world. And there is a natural wonder, not absorbed by the several sciences, which without further motive would drive us to metaphysical inquiry. The world is worth knowing about!

But philosophy also seeks wisdom in regard to the conduct of life: it would be hard to say which is the more primitive interest, the theoretical or the practical. Hence, in the second place:

7. *Beliefs about better and worse, right and wrong:* the theme of ethics.

In some uses of the word, philosophy is identified with this practical interest. To "take a thing philosophically" is to take it without undue disturbance of mind,—without too much depression, if it is a misfortune, or without too much elation in the opposite case. And it is to take things this way not because one is insensitive, but because one has attained a just valuation of the various objects of life, of what is better and what is worse, and is prepared for sufficient reasons to consider tolerable the pains or losses which overwhelm more trivial judges.

It is the Stoics (Zeno of Citium, Epictetus, Marcus Aurelius and others) who are chiefly responsible for giving the phrase this color. It was their aim to attain "equanimity," to become superior to remorse or anger, to "bear and forbear," to school themselves to a life of complete fearlessness through achieving a capacity to accept with perfect serenity whatever might occur whether through natural event, or through fortune, or through the consequences of doing their duty. Bœthius, who wrote "On the Consolations of Philosophy" in a Roman prison, had much to do with transmitting this meaning to English usage. For his work was translated into Anglo-Saxon by Alfred the Great, and into English prose by Chaucer and a series of successors.

The noble endurance of hardship is only an aspect, and a negative aspect, of the wise conduct of

life. The fundamental question is, What can we make of existence? There are those who regard the conditions of human life as intrinsically bad. The array of desires with which nature has provided us, and which under the control of will and reason are apparently destined to serve as guides to pleasure, and perhaps to happiness, are to be distrusted. There is illusion for the will, as for the intellect, in the whole scheme of nature; and the wise man will keep his desires and hopes in check, finding his chief good first in contemplation and then in ultimate nescience. This outlook of *pessimism*, widespread in the Orient, in Brahmanism and the teachings of Buddha, has been given expression in the West by Schopenhauer, von Hartmann and others. Opposed to this is the prevalent temper of the affirmation of life, the temper of *optimism*, which believes that the world and man are so adjusted that the attainment of happiness is the normal order of things. The will and the environment in which it plays are attuned to each other: and we can wisely give ourselves to a study of the positive aims of action, whether for our own personal enjoyment (*egoism*) or for the sake of others (*altruism*).

We have been speaking of the pursuit of happiness or of the good. But what of 'duty'? Is that the same as the general obligation to use discretion in the pursuit of good? Or are there rules which, like the rules of a game, give structure to

our conduct without altering its objects, and qualify some ways of reaching our end as definitely right or wrong? If so, what is the source of these rules or standards of right and wrong?

And are these rules fixed in the nature of things, or do they change with the *mores*, or different stages of social usage? The pervasiveness of change is dinned into our ears. "Old rules of politics and law" we are reminded, "religion and sex, art and letters—the whole domain of culture—must yield or break before the inexorable pressure of science and the machine." Important, if true: and simplifying many difficult questions, if all that wisdom has to suggest is to yield at once to whatever science and the machine would like to do with us. But perhaps there are other sources of obligation, even more persistent than these; and perhaps there are certain principles of right and wrong, founded in the nature of things and in human nature, which, changing in their application from age to age, are yet permanent in their central meaning. Nothing would be better worth knowing at the present moment than the answer to this question.

Perhaps, too, there is something in duty which affects the ends we pursue, as well as the rules whereby we pursue them. As many of the wisest heads from Aristotle onward have seen the world, nature herself seems to be struggling toward a certain perfection, by way of what we to-day call

evolution; and there is something laid upon us to fall in with that great effort. Such questions experience sets before every man sooner or later; and these are the questions which philosophy considers under the head of ethics.

8. Now consider: What are your more decided beliefs at the present moment? Distinguish your beliefs from your idler, non-working opinions. Take one of your major beliefs, whether in metaphysics or ethics, politics or religion, or science, for a brief examination. Ask yourself on what grounds you have been holding that belief. These grounds may be one or more of the following list: or you may find that the grounds which have influenced you are not included here.

Prejudice:

Authority of elder persons or of tradition;
Suggestion from social surroundings;
Literary or dramatic suggestion.

Intuition:

A feeling of certainty based on a personal experience of insight, as if one should say, I believe in free will because I am sometimes immediately conscious of freedom.

Good results:

Holding to a belief because, on the whole, it works well to believe it, fits in well with one's scheme of thinking and living, makes

existence more hopeful or otherwise satisfactory, or seems desirable for the good of mankind; this mode of judging belief is called *pragmatism.*

"*Reason,*" an ambiguous term which may mean one or more of several different sorts of ground, as:

Self-evident truth, and deductions therefrom, as when one holds it to be a self-evident truth that all men are created equal, and deduces therefrom that men should share equally in the protection of law and the choice of rulers. Those who hold that our important beliefs can be and ought to be established in this way are called *rationalists.*

Experience: that is to say, observation of facts, and generalization (or induction) from such observations, as when one who observes that the state of the mind regularly changes with the state of the body infers that this will always be the case, and that the death of the body will therefore bring with it the death of the mind. Those who hold that there are no self-evident general truths (or none of importance), and that our important beliefs are only well established when based on experience are called *empiricists.**

* There are, of course, no rationalists who do not, like all human beings, learn much of their philosophy by the aid of experience. And there are no empiricists who do not, as in the illustration here

The questions we have here raised about the foundations of your beliefs are questions which belong to a branch of philosophy called the theory of knowledge or *epistemology*. They arise after men have undertaken to examine their beliefs in metaphysics and ethics; have come to see the difficulty of attaining certainty; and have concluded to institute a careful preliminary inquiry about the possibility of getting certain knowledge in philosophy. Thus we build up a group of beliefs about belief, and its attainment.

We have now identified three main branches of philosophy: metaphysics, ethics, and the theory of knowledge. A completer scheme would include also logic, esthetics, and psychology, and might be mapped out as follows:

Theoretical philosophy:
- Metaphysics: beliefs about reality;
- Epistemology: beliefs about belief;
- Logic: the technique of reasoning, sometimes included in

Practical philosophy, or the philosophy of values:
- Ethics: beliefs about the principles of conduct;
- Esthetics: beliefs about the principles of beauty.

given, make constant use of deduction. The only issue between them is whether there is *any* general truth which is not somehow born from experience. Empiricists and rationalists, being both committed to the use of reason, deductive or inductive or both, are sometimes loosely referred to as rationalists in a wider sense of the word. It is the business of the science of logic to discuss in detail these various uses of reason.

Psychology: a natural science of the mind bearing on all branches of philosophy, and borne upon by them.

9. *Types of philosophy.* Beliefs about reality are crucial beliefs in the sense that they usually bring other beliefs with them, beliefs in religion, ethics and elsewhere. This is as it should be: for a man's arrangement of his practical principles can hardly fail to be governed to some extent by the kind of world he supposes he is dealing with. And vice versa, the sort of thing a man deals with successfully, whether rocks, colors, money, or men, will appear real to him and will affect his judgment about reality.

Our beliefs thus tend to form clusters, hanging from some significant stem-belief: such clusters we call types of philosophy. Naturalism and idealism are evidently two such types. They are metaphysical beliefs to begin with; but they carry with them different outlooks in ethics, psychology, esthetics. They present the most fundamental contrast in the general outlook on life with which we have to deal.

Other clusters of belief are formed about the stems of the various *theories of knowledge*, that is to say, the various beliefs about how beliefs ought to be reached and established. For evidently our ways of looking for truth will have some influence on what we find. Thus "rationalism" or "prag-

matism" or "intuitionism," while they do not settle finally what conclusions a thinker will reach in metaphysics or ethics, have certain characteristic tendencies, and so deserve to be regarded as types of philosophy.

10. If we were going to set up a complete scheme of the types of philosophy, historical or possible, we should have to consider many shades and interconnections of thought which I am proposing to ignore.

(It would be of great interest, for example, to take the practical side of philosophy as furnishing certain stem-beliefs, and see how far divergent attitudes of the *will* carried with them characteristic differences in metaphysics and theory of knowledge. For there is no doubt that the temper or set of will with which a man begins his thinking will affect the world-view he arrives at. There is at least so much truth in the caustic remark of Fichte that "the kind of philosophy a man adopts depends on the kind of man he is." William James thought that the splitting-place of opposing world-views lies in the contrast of temperaments: the "tender-minded" want an architecturally handsome, rationalistic and idealistic philosophy, while the "tough-minded" prefer a loose-ended, empirical, realistic view.* According to Karl Marx, it is not the ethical nor the esthetic, but the

* Pragmatism, p. 12.

economic side of the will, the prudential and technical interests, which govern all the rest of our thinking. If these thinkers are right in finding the root of all philosophical differences in differences of the will, the most clearly marked types of philosophy ought to be those which are defined by such contrasts as optimism and pessimism, or Epicurean and Stoic, or happiness-ethics and formal-law-ethics. I have been surprised to find how little there is in the history of philosophy to bear this out. Ethical differences have followed metaphysical types far more clearly than metaphysical differences have followed ethical types.)

Let me confess then at the outset that I am not interested in completeness: the idea of "types" is intended to preserve us from the unmanageable voluminousness and intricate interdistinctions of an "adequate survey,"—to my mind an enemy of thought, and one of the chief curses of American education. My aim is to present enough of the great and lasting issues so that students may recognize and place their own thoughts, be prepared to appreciate the greater thinkers of the race, and equipped to work out for themselves a world-view which shall be better-considered than the naïve and impressionistic hodge-podge which is likely to come of inexperienced thinking. We want to consider, not all types of philosophy, but such types as are pre-eminently 'natural,'—natural in the sense that some voice in their favor will be found

in all the great ages of human thought; and in the further sense that in *every individual human mind* there will be some tendency to look at things that way.

If you rightly understand the types, as we review them, you will find in yourself **some inclination** toward each one in turn:* and this inclination will not be wholly mistaken. For we shall consider no type which has not much truth in it. When we have finished our review, we shall have to answer—and shall try to answer—the question, How these various partial truths can be set into a single consistent philosophy.

* It may be that as you read you will find yourself commenting: "This is nearly what I believe, but not quite;—with a little modification, it would do." That also will be right. We shall be aiming to study *pure types*, extreme of their kind, and therefore not precisely identical with the outlook of any contemporary mind, which is likely to be sophisticated, composite, 'eclectic,' holding a mixture of types in which each view is mitigated by some ingredient from another. These composite philosophies may be nearer the truth than the pure types; but they are (1) not so good as types, (2) not so consistent, and (3) not so valuable in finding our bearings. For winning our own truth, we would better work with pure colors than with mixtures.

GENERAL REFERENCE BOOKS

I. *On the history of philosophy*

Every student of the Types, just because he is not studying the history of philosophy, would do well to have at hand some good book on this history, so that he may turn to it for light on the persons who interest him, and their setting.

Rogers, A. K. Student's History of Philosophy. A markedly readable and reliable book for beginners.

Durant, Will. The Story of Philosophy. Conveys some of the essential spirit of philosophy, its aspiration and ageless charm, without being reliable in detail. To my mind, the chapters on Spinoza, Spencer, and Nietzsche are especially good.

Santayana, George. Winds of Doctrine. Characterizing with a marvellously deft, discerning, and biased pen the spirit of various contemporary thinkers.

Weber and Perry. History of Philosophy. A sober and full account for maturer students.

Perry, R. B., Philosophy of the Recent Past, and Rogers, A. K., English and American Philosophy Since 1800, give valuable accounts of several of the recent writers, as Bergson, James, Royce, with whom we shall be concerned.

II. *Writings of the philosophers*

For English versions of the texts (or parts of the texts) of the great thinkers of the past, the following are useful:

Bakewell, Charles. A Source Book in Ancient Philosophy.

Rand, B. Modern Classical Philosophers, and Classical Moralists.

An excellent series of selections (original texts or translations) is published by Scribners (Scribner Philosophy Series). Everyman's Library contains a number of classics; and there are now available other good and inexpensive editions of the greater philosophers, or samples of them.

Robinson, D. S., Anthology of Recent Philosophy. Contains valuable illustrations from contemporary writers, by types.

III. *On the problems of philosophy*

Each of the following introductions has notable merit, and no one of them resembles any other:

Calkins, M. W. The Persistent Problems of Philosophy.

Paulsen, F. Introduction to Philosophy.

Patrick, G. T. W. The World and Its Meaning.

Russell, Bertrand. The Problems of Philosophy.

Sheldon, W. H. The Strife of Systems, an original alignment and more advanced discussion of philosophic types, deserves a place by itself.

Chapter II

THE ORIGINAL FORM OF PHILOSOPHY: SPIRITUALISM

11. There was never a time when mankind was without some form of philosophy, as a set of beliefs about the world we live in. The examination of these beliefs is relatively modern, only two or three thousand years old probably.

In the previous long and idyllic period of uncriticised philosophizing there is a great deal that is worth our attention. Does it seem to you that we ever get away from primitive views, or that we ought to? Whoever says yes must be able to think that a common human belief about an important concern can be *all wrong*. For one, I cannot believe it: wrongness seems to me, in such cases, to eat away the periphery, but to leave something central intact. During the ages we have improved our mental operations, but we have not reversed them; and even the improvements have been made at some cost: what would we give for the memories or the powers of observation of some savages? We have developed a power of voluntary concentration of attention unknown to early man: and we have lost a certain sense of proportion in our general impression of the world that was quite native to him. We try sometimes to put aside our sophistication and see the world with the aborigi-

nal simplicity of outlook: philosophers have been known to inquire, as an important bit of analysis, what is it that is 'given' to us in experience, apart from all that our acquired knowledge intrudes upon it: this is somewhat like trying to pass a half-hour without once thinking of the word 'hippopotamus.' For pure freshness of outlook, we should have to see things vicariously through the eyes of primitive man. We are doubtless in a far better position for judging the world sanely than he was. I am only saying that he was probably not all wrong, and therefore that we shall not be all right unless we have something in common with him. His views will always be refreshing and deserve our respect.

12. The original form of philosophy was contained in religion, that is, in what we call religion. But in the precritical ages, religion was not as with us a special outlook and mode of life which some members of the community adopted and others not: it was one of the normal aspects of community life. Religion, let us say, is the habitual reference of life to divine powers: to the primitive view these powers though invisible are indubitably there. They are the causes of many visible effects, and are to be reckoned with as part of ordinary prudence.

The most obvious part of religion is the *practical* reference of life to these powers, showing

itself in observances and codes. There is magic as a technique, side by side with the scientific technique for securing luck. There is prayer, as an appeal to the powers, either by way of bargaining, or of securing something of their super-power in oneself, fortifying oneself for the crises of existence. There are special invocations and spells for times of trouble. There are the great ceremonies which celebrate death, marriage, birth, coronation, victory, public penance; and which bring communities together in devotion to an object of loyalty which, standing behind the ruler and behind the law, abets the power of both, and aids the early efforts for social cohesion.

But this practical and overt side of religion implies a *theoretical* reference of life to these powers,—a creed. It is the ideas of the creed which constitute the philosophy whose meaning is embodied in the code and the ritual. Early creeds are seldom worked out in explicit formulas; they may be expressed in myth and poetry, or more dumbly, simply in the traditional observance. In any case, it is these ideas we are now concerned with. They constitute the background against which all human philosophizing takes place.

13. With the general cast of these ideas every one is familiar,—ideas of a supernatural realm peopled by superhuman agencies—spirits, souls,

deities—distinct from the visible realm of nature and yet in active intercourse with it.

We shall ignore the vast variety of imaginative representation of that supernatural world which distinguishes the different religions and stages of religion,—all the lore of precivilized fancies, the polytheisms of antiquity, the emergence here and there of monotheism, the development of the great ethnic religions and of the universal religions of to-day. It will require something of a *tour de force* to say what is common to all this philosophic multitude. Yet there are common elements. What would you think of the following as an attempt to summarize them?

There exists another world than this world shown us by the senses.

This other-world is somehow veiled from our ordinary perceptions; and yet it is continuous with nature, and of easy access in either direction if one has the right path;

It is the residence of powers or agencies which we distinguish as divine; they always know how to get at us; we are not so clear how to get at them;

This word 'divine' indicates a superiority both in *power* (or reality) and in *worth*,—the human world, which may not last forever, being regarded as derived from that other world, which is eternal, as constantly dependent upon it, and as obligated to the deference of worship and obedience;

There are ways of living which are in harmony with the divine powers, and other ways which are strictly out of harmony; and these ways can be known;

The souls of men, or some of them, pass over at death into this other world.

This proto-philosophy, which in developed religion centres about the ideas of God and immortality, we shall call Spiritualism.

14. No one knows how these ideas arose originally; and from one point of view, it is an idle question. Historically there is evidently nothing to check the free play of speculation on this point, and speculation has taken full advantage of its liberty. Almost any one can explain the origin of religion, prior to having considered the question. But there are particular reasons for trying to get some more or less sensible notions about the origins of religious ideas: namely, the ideas themselves are elusive; the words we use, being taken from our experience of this world, do not precisely apply to the 'other' world; the best clew to their meaning, if we could get it, would be the context of experience which gave birth to them.

The various theories which have been held and are held about these origins indicate to my mind that there is no one source of them, but a variety of roots which we may designate the speculative, the emotional and the ethical.

15. *The speculative root.* Nothing is more certain than that religious ideas do not arise (as Herbert Spencer in an unguarded moment suggests) as a "theory of original causation": we cannot picture early man as sitting down to meditate on where he and the world of nature came from. Wonder does not at first extend so far; but begins with more local exhibitions of power such as excite admiration or alarm. Nevertheless, as long as the human animal has been human there has been some free play of speculative inquiry: the mind has been prone to run out along the lines of natural phenomena to the edge of traceable causation and then to take the leap into the imperceptible. The mystery of the stars in their courses, and the miraculous rebirth of vegetation after its seasonal death have left few races uninquisitive.

Dreams and hallucinations have been supposed to contribute something to the idea of another world in which souls may survive and enjoy unusual powers. Perhaps, something. But the divine powers are not all visualized by early man, still less by later man, however much they may use pictorial language. Mana, wakonda and the like are names for an impersonal energy, not for a quasi-human shape such as a dream might present. The gods of early man are powers of his waking as well as of his dreaming states. It is likely that certain ideas of divine power are de-

rived from intense social experience; for the spirit of the human group does on occasion inspire and command its members and lift them beyond their ordinary selves.

But the imagery of the idea is less important than the conviction which the idea registers, and which seems to deepen with time, that just as the several things and events of the world cannot simply happen but imply some authorship, so the world itself and our presence in it raises a question of producership or responsibility which the human mind cannot abandon. There must be—so reason seems to say—a creator of the world, or a number of co-operating creators.

16. *The emotional root.* The divine is a power, and as such is a fact; but it is always more than a fact, namely, a *quality.* It is regarded as 'holy' or 'sacred.' Ideas of this sort are not products of our cooler states of reflection, but rather of feeling.

The old theory that "fear made the gods" is thus better than any theory which refers these ideas to pure speculation. But the emotion concerned can hardly have been fear. For while there is much evidence of an early fear of the spirits, the primitive language of religion is derived from expressions of admiration and wonder: the divine is the 'excellent' or the 'bright and shining,' like the sun or like fire. Religion evidently had something in it (like the fear of ghosts) to make early

man more timorous in the world than he would have been without it; and just as evidently it had something in it (like the guardian spirits, totems, fetiches) to give him greater confidence in the world than he would have had without it. The presumption is, then, that religion is due to some emotional experience in which man seemed to perceive that the powers which behind the veil of nature were actually controlling things, and which because of their greatness and their uncanny nature might well be dreaded, are really friendly or auspicious!

Now any such impression on the part of primitive man is at least noteworthy. For he had far less reason than we have to regard the world as friendly: he had fewer defenses against death, disease, or famine; he had, perhaps, less to live for; his struggle for bare existence was incessant, and physical nature often threatened to wipe him out. Yet he had a religion which consisted very largely in a systematic defiance of the pretense of nature to be his master. The great ceremony of early religion, if not of all religion, is the ceremony of putting away the dead: and that ceremony is an instituted denial of the sensibly obvious fact that nature has conquered. Almost universally there is some provision made—often at heavy material sacrifice—for the wayfaring soul which is alleged to have survived and to have taken its journey. How do you explain this belief

in survival? Is it the result of our propensity to feign as true what we would like to believe? If so, the luxury has been a costly one. Or remembering that crises of feeling are also moments of intense mental activity may it have been the result of some change in the objective vista of things (corresponding to a revulsion of feeling) when under the influence of strong grief or resentment men of acuter insight perceived that nature is only a part of the universe, and that behind its cruel appearance there is a benign reality?

In either case the religious idea means a discovery (or 'revelation') that there is a way of looking at things which turns the edge of the worst evils of experience, namely, by assuming a supernatural supplement in which the incompleteness of the present life is rounded out and our deepest values are conserved.

17. *The ethical root.* The friendliness, or potential friendliness, of the gods is only a part of their divine quality; another part is their severity as a source of moral requirement. The context in which this idea arises may be the circumstance that man has had to work out his life under a course of restraints and taboos which limit the free exercise of his instinctive impulse. No social life is possible at all without some curbing of native pugnacity, greed and sex-impulse: and no doubt the belief that the gods, with their "Thou

shalt not's," are on the side of these demands for self-control has greatly aided the early stages of social evolution. But how did it come about that the gods were supposed to be on that side, or concerned about the matter at all?

There are two views. Some suppose that the connection was a man-made affair. Early leaders or rulers, having a responsibility for getting laws observed, would have a motive to appeal to the prestige of the supernatural already established. Most early codes of law have, in fact, come with a "Thus saith the Lord" as an introduction; Rousseau in his Social Contract points out how profoundly the great legislator needs this sort of backing,—"It would require gods," said this apostle of pure democracy, "to give laws to men." The other view is that each individual realizes more or less dimly that the call for self-restraint is in the direction of his own growth, and would be there even if there were no artificial social requirement. There is something in personal affection which naturally limits selfishness and sensuality, apart from all lawgivers. The notion that this same control is due from us, beyond the small circle of affection, to all members of the community, or to all men, would suggest itself to the mind when trying for the wider view of things, including the natural and the supernatural.

In my opinion, the latter view is the only reasonable view to take. Unless men were sensible

that there was something in the eternal bent of the world summoning them toward decency and consideration of their neighbors, the political announcement of a "Thus saith the Lord" would have fallen on ears dull if not deaf. There is in every man a dim sense of obligation which refers outward, and naturally connects with his notions of the divine if he has them, or may even be strong enough to beget such notions. The 'holy' is something beyond us, something real, before which we are constrained to humility, and it may be to penitence. Certainly those who represent these fundamental restraints as something which men would never observe without a politically exploited religion are blind to some of the plainest facts of human nature.

18. The roots of religious ideas are thus various, and these ideas are themselves various; only by a long and painful struggle do they find their way together in orderly creeds. Primitive religion collects, under a vague sense of supernature, all the exalting and exciting experiences of life, without much discrimination; and runs its ceremonial enthusiasms in the direction of high artistic and ethical achievement, the development of dance, drama, architecture, or in the direction of orgiastic excess, intoxication, war-frenzies, fanaticism and general degradation of human energy.

The theoretical clarifying of religion takes the

direction of unifying the world of the gods, and working out the relations of God and the world, under the notions of creation, miracle, providence. Miracle, the occasional intervention of deity in natural affairs, tends to lose itself in the notion of providence: for when God does everything, nothing stands out as specifically supernatural. In primitive religions the divine action is local, but there are myriads of such agencies, so that everything may be suspected of being the work of some spirit. In the most developed religions, this universal divine action is recovered; but it is the one God who is everywhere. His action is miraculous, but miraculously silent and unobtrusive.

It is in these ideas of miracle and providence that Spiritualism first encounters the hostile opposition of the early efforts toward systematic science.

19. The practical disadvantages of religion were felt before the theoretical; because when science was in its cruder stages, it also was only a spot-wise connection of physical facts and could coexist with supernatural intrusion without discomfort. But the practical wastefulness of religion had been early felt; the mounting losses of providing for the dead, the costs of vast temples and priestly tribes subtracted from the general social capital; the losses of patent opportunity in waiting for favorable auguries before giving bat-

tle or launching a ship. The more subtle losses, the alienation of human affection from this earth to another, the mental waste of much idle contemplation of the unseen, were less impressive to ancient civilizations.

But when science began a systematic growth, as it did among the Greeks, conflict with the theoretical structure of Spiritualism was inevitable. The idea of natural law could not live comfortably with miracle. The cure of disease by hygiene and medicine must clash with the cure by charms and incantations. Hippocrates, the father of Western medicine, was perhaps the first to announce the conflict. In a treatise of about 400 B. C., in dealing with epilepsy, then commonly called the Sacred disease, he says,

> "As regards the disease called *Sacred*, to me it appears to be no more divine than other diseases, but to have a *physis* just like other diseases. Men regard its origin as divine from ignorance and wonder, since it is a peculiar condition and not readily understood. Yet if it be reckoned divine merely because wonderful, then instead of one there would be many sacred diseases. To me it appears that they who refer such conditions to the gods are but as certain charlatans who claim to be excessively religious and to know what is hidden from others."*

This conflict was incompletely worked out in Greek thought but it was renewed at the beginning of what we call the modern era, and fought

* As quoted and translated by Charles Singer in Science, Religion and Reality, ed. J. Needham, p. 95 f.

to a finish. In the short space of a hundred years, from Copernicus (1473–1543) to Galileo (1564–1642) the work which gave natural science its freedom was in principle accomplished. In fact, it is still going on. We do not need to go to Russia, where in many of the rural districts the ruin of crops by insect pests is averted by holy processions around the threatened fields and the sprinkling of holy water, to find instances of the work that is left to do.

20. But what is this warfare? Is it a warfare of science with religion? No, for religion is a way of life, not a theory. Of science with theology? To some extent, though science and theology do not come into contact along the whole front of either. Of science with superstition? Yes. But suppose that we declare, as I think we must, that in any such contest science must be given everything it claims, is there anything left of the theoretical structure of Spiritualism?

Socrates, who lived in the midst of the Greek argument, thought that something was left. To him the business of life was conducted by three guides: the ordinary technique by science, the ethical principles by rational philosophy, and the greater decisions by the divine monitors and oracles. For, as he said, "The gods have reserved to themselves the most important events."* Others,

* Xenophon, Memorabilia, Cassell ed., p. 11.

in increasing numbers, have considered that science has rendered all reference of life to the divine powers meaningless; for the alleged world of supernature does not exist. These are the Naturalists,* and their view of the world is the first type of philosophy we shall examine in detail.

* It will be sufficient to note, without the continued insistence of the capital letter, that not every naturalist is a Naturalist, nor every Naturalist a naturalist.

REFERENCES ON SCIENCE AND RELIGION

Needham, Joseph, ed. Science, Religion and Reality. London, 1925. A collection of essays of extraordinary merit. Those of Malinowski, Singer, Eddington, and Needham are especially valuable.

White, Andrew D. Warfare of Science and Theology. 1896. Still the standard history of this special topic.

Simpson, James Y. Landmarks in the Struggle Between Science and Religion. 1925.

Whitehead, A. N. Science and the Modern World. 1926.

See also the histories of philosophy for the period of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, giving especial notice to the work of Copernicus, Kepler, Bruno, Galileo, Newton.

For the religious outlook of the Greeks at the time of the first self-assertion of the scientific spirit:

Cornford, F. M. From Religion to Philosophy. 1912.

Fuller, B. A. G. History of Greek Philosophy, ch. ii.

TYPE I

NATURALISM

NATURALISM

References for reading

I. *Books representing the naturalistic outlook*

For brief descriptions of some of these works, see section 30.

Lucretius. De Rerum Natura. (Part in Bakewell.)
Büchner, Louis. Force and Matter.
Haeckel, Ernst. The Riddle of the Universe. 1899.
Huxley, T. H. Lay Sermons.
Spencer, H. First Principles. Data of Ethics.
Nietzsche, Friedrich. Beyond Good and Evil. Thus Spake Zarathustra. Genealogy of Morals.
Ostwald, Wilhelm. Natural Philosophy (tr. Seltzer).
Elliot, Hugh, Modern Science and Materialism.
Russell, Bertrand. What I Believe.
Santayana, George. Skepticism and Animal Faith.
Sellars, R. W. Evolutionary Naturalism.
Moore, B. M. The Origin and Nature of Life. (Home Univ. Lib.)

II. *Books criticising naturalism*

Note that most of the types of philosophy later considered will be more or less critical of the foundations of naturalism. The following books are especially pertinent to our argument at the present point:

Ward, James. Naturalism and Agnosticism. 2 vols. 1896–98. Elaborate, but clear and forcible.
Fiske, John. The Destiny of Man. Through Nature to God. Fiske, philosopher and historian, was a theistic follower of Herbert Spencer.
LeConte, Joseph. Evolution: Its Relation to Religious Thought. 1888. Geologist: teacher of Josiah Royce.
Howison, G. H. The Limits of Evolution.
Lodge, Oliver. Life and Matter. A physicist's reply to Haeckel.
Perry, R. B. Present Philosophical Tendencies. Ch. iv. Excellent analysis; somewhat advanced. Discusses Büchner (68), Spencer (70), Haeckel (72).
Henderson, L. J. The Fitness of the Environment. 1913. A biological chemist argues that causal explanation cannot close the door to teleology in nature.
Thompson, J. Arthur. Concerning Evolution. 1925. A biologist in a popular summary of the present state of the argument.
Millikan, Robert A. Evolution in Science and Religion. 1927. A review of the changed outlook in physics.
Hocking, W. E. The Self, Its Body and Freedom. 1928.
Whitehead, A. N. Science and the Modern World. 1926. Difficult but inspired.
Eddington, A. S. The Nature of the Physical World, 1929.

Chapter III

THE NATURALISTIC VIEW OF THE WORLD

21. *What Naturalism is.* Naturalism is the type of metaphysics which takes Nature as the whole of reality. That is, it excludes whatever is supernatural or other-worldly. Whatever appears independent of natural law, such as human life or the products of imagination, is really a part of the scheme of nature: everything comes from nature and returns to nature. No doubt there is something hidden, something for which science has to search, but that hidden thing is nature itself, not anything beyond or behind nature.

What is this all-inclusive 'nature'? Nature may be defined as the sum of things and events in space and time, subject to a single system of causal laws.

There are different varieties of naturalism, according to the differing conceptions of what these things in space and time, in the ultimate analysis, are. If, as was formerly the case, they were considered as atoms of matter in motion,—every phenomenon being in reality just that,—we have *materialism.* If matter itself is regarded as a form of energy, and everything else is thought reduci-

ble to some form of energy, we have *energism.* Or if we refrain from deciding what the ultimate stuff of the world is, but insist that everything that is real is linked up with other things in causal order, and therefore comes under the observation of some one of the positive sciences, we have *positivism.*

Materialism is sometimes used as a general name for all such views as these, equivalent to naturalism. It implies simply the explanation of the crude phenomena of experience by the eternal flux of motions of the ultimate entities of the world in the impalpable medium of space. There is nothing 'crass' about this view: these ultimate realities in any case are of inconceivable fineness, more like light rays in their essence than like the clod; and to their infinitely subtle pulsations mathematical enquiry, though it may be baffled, is always relevant. For, at least in the traditional picture, there is an impeccable lawfulness in the minutest crevices of nature.

22. *The negations of Naturalism.* The peculiar force of naturalism lies in what it denies. The imaginative fringe added to the field of sense-experience by religious speculation shrinks to the dimensions of what can, in principle, be measured and controlled; and the whole metaphysical horizon is at once limited and simplified.

The disappearance of the 'other world' implies

that there is no God (unless Nature itself or Humanity can serve as an object of worship). There is no immortality nor any sort of survival of death, unless the lasting effects of one's life and doings, or the cherishing of one's memory by later generations, can serve as a sort of immortality. There is nothing in the human being more than what he derives from the natural causes which have produced him. If we mean by 'soul' something in man distinct from nature, there is no soul.

Since there is nothing to intrude upon the regular processes of nature, miracle and providence are excluded; and prayer becomes a meaningless performance, unless one keeps it up for æsthetic or disciplinary or therapeutic effect.

And there can be no 'freedom of the will,' if one means thereby a capacity in man of deviating from the line fixed by the causal processes which flow into him and out of him. Naturalism implies determinism. "The laws which govern man's behavior are the same as the laws of the movements of the stars and the atoms." You have the feeling of free decision, looking forward: you say, "I have not yet decided what I shall do." Your atoms have decided, together with the rest of the world: you will do what you must.

If freedom means doing as you choose, you are free. But, as Spencer reminds you, you always do as you please; you cannot do anything else. That

is where nature has you: what you please to do is what nature has caused you to please. "You can do as you please; but you cannot please as you please." Your preference is the means whereby nature works her will in your behavior.

Finally, conscious reason is not one of the original and permanent facts of the world. The kind of mentality we have in human beings is a transitory feature of things, evolved out of lower organisms, and probably ultimately out of completely inanimate things. (Haeckel believes that some primitive form of psychic being everywhere accompanies matter; so that mind and matter are eternal in every atom. This kind of mentality is of course not rational; and the view itself is not widely shared among naturalists.) And, so far as we can see, reason will again flicker out into the inanimate. The enduring realities do not think nor plan: there is no reason nor purpose for the world as a whole.

23. *Naturalism and experience.* No one can escape a strong inclination to naturalism. Reality can be roughly defined as that which corrects our illusions. This is what the substantial facts of nature are always doing; they cure our excesses of fancy, and reduce the castles built by our subjective wishes. They do this work of sobering and correcting best when we are active. We may sit still in the desert and find no refutation of our

mirage; but motion banishes the dream. During the course of the centuries, man has become increasingly mobile and aggressive; and increasingly, too, his thinking is done in close connection with his acting, and thus healthily exposed to the constant battering of the Realities. Our occupations always define for us some aspect of reality; whatever we are daily occupied with and can deal with successfully, making it respond to our wills,—that we regard as real. To the banker, the flimsy figures on his account sheets represent realities; to the artist, his colors and the things of beauty he can produce with them: and these may or may not seem to the banker as unreal as the abstractions of financial credit to the artist. But there is one universal occupation, the occupation with physical things, place and motion, food and shelter, physical labor which fortunately no one wholly escapes. Hence these objects around which after preliminary defeats and corrections we build our successful habits become regarded as real not by special classes of men but by the race.

Then again no one escapes a constant reminder of how fragile the mind is, and how constantly dependent it is on the physical world. One may defy nature to the extent of reducing food to one meal a day instead of three; but not to none; reducing sleep to three hours, but not to none; prolonging life but not escaping death. Meals become social occasions largely because of their democ-

racy; eating is the confession of a necessity before which all ranks have to bow. Further, changes of food, temperature, energy or fatigue, condition, health affect the state of mind. The mind develops with the body, and old age brings decrepitude to both. Death ends our communication with the personality, and we have no tangible evidence that it has escaped the fate of the body.

As for the forces at work in the world outside us, if there is any god among them his distinguishable effects are elusive. The ruling powers of the world appear indifferent alike to individual human interests and to the hopes of the race. If the relentless laws of nature are prevented from working cruelty as well as benefit it is only, so far as we can see, because some human will intervenes. And if no earlier catastrophe occurs, the decline of available heat must some day destroy all life on the planet. Human life is mounted upon a sub-human pedestal, and must shift for itself alone in the heart of a silent and mindless universe. We ask ourselves, then, whether apart from our wishes and imaginations the coolly rational explanation of the world is not that of impersonal physical law. Naturalism is the philosophy of our disillusionment.

24. *Naturalism and science.* The affirmative part of naturalism is the sum of all the truth that belongs to the field of the sciences. But since

there is no type of philosophy which calls the truths of science into question this is not peculiar to Naturalism.

The special sciences, such as physics, chemistry, biology, have nothing to say for or against naturalism; inasmuch as they have nothing to say about the world as a whole. Each of them deals with a partial province. Neither singly nor all together do they constitute a philosophy. And none of them makes any statement about the non-existence of objects outside its domain; nor do they make any collective statement to the effect that all of reality is included in what they survey. It is not science which adopts naturalism: it is naturalism which adopts science as the metaphysical guide. Science cannot be brought forward as a witness in favor of naturalism,—not directly.

But scientific work carries with it a strong impression to the effect that natural law rules all happenings without exception. It is not merely the expanding success of 'scientific method,' a success beyond expectations, in bringing one by one the supposedly inexplicable aspects of experience into understandable and predictable control. It is that, when we consider it closely, we cannot mention any phenomenon which we can safely say is out of the reach of such explanation. "The admission of the occurrence of any event," said Huxley, "which was not the logical consequence of immediately antecedent events would be an act

of self-surrender on the part of science." The assumption that every event is the consequence (I query the word 'logical') of a previous state of things is one the scientist is obliged to make by the very nature of his work.

Thus science tends indirectly to favor naturalism by crowding the more-than-natural out, leaving no room for it. The hypotheses of free will, vital force, divine working are not only superfluous, from this point of view, but positively in the way. If one must rest one's belief in supernature on the regions of experience not yet scientifically explained, it is evident that that belief rests on a rapidly narrowing base: and that science looking forward can concede to it no place which must forever remain inexplicable. Can you suggest any such?

This completeness of the scope of scientific explanation is re-enforced by the incredible accuracy of the microscopic and sub-microscopic measurements which physics uses in tracing reality to its last hiding place. New discoveries in science to-day are commonly made by examining the infinitesimal residues which older explanations leave unaccounted for. Those minute remainders which have become so precious as cues to the investigator will certainly not be willingly surrendered by him to the 'obscurantist' who desires them as support for an argument for a supernatural agent.

As a general principle of thinking, William of Occam (d. 1347) left to posterity the so-called Law of Parsimony, to the effect that what is well explained on one ground is not to be explained again on another. *Entia non sunt multiplicanda praeter necessitatem.* If then there is nothing which, in principle, natural causes cannot explain, supernatural causes may be dismissed.

25. *Naturalism and evolution.* The phenomena which have given the greatest difficulty to scientific explanation are life and mind. They seem to stand out from other things, so that their origin forms an exception to the general rule of nature that like always causes like. It is true that, so far as experience has yet gone, living things are never produced by anything but by previous living things: though products of the laboratory are coming every year closer to the construction of a living cell. But if naturalism is right, the living and animate thing must somehow have come out of the non-living and inanimate. One who sees clearly the contrast between the living and the non-living can understand how generations of scientists who believed that the mechanics of the world could explain everything else, still agreed, or were unprepared to resist the view, that some divine act was necessary to produce the many species of organisms and the human soul.

For the student of philosophy to-day, the dif-

ficulty will be to get an adequate sense of the contrast. We are living in an era when sharp distinctions of this sort have been so obscured by newly devised intermediaries that many who are unable to think clearly see no difficulty whatever in a gradual transformation from the inorganic to the organic, and from the non-conscious to the conscious. Let us then first ask, What are the peculiarities of life and of mind?

The most striking characteristics of living things can best be told by aid of the word 'self': they are self-building, self-repairing, self-regulating, self-reproducing. There are machines which feed themselves; but there are none that grow by what they feed on. There are self-righting machines, automatic equilibrators, self-steering torpedoes; but there are none that repair their own injuries, or adjust themselves to an unlimited range of variable conditions. As for self-reproduction, there is no machine nor chemical product which develops within itself a germ containing the capacity not merely to grow to another like the original, but to produce within itself a germ having the same capacity, and so on forever; as if within one organism there were packed away, in cells within cells, an infinite series of completely specified mature individuals! The 'self' of the living organism, to us who look on, means an identifiable outline through which there is a constant flow of matter and energy,

its metabolism: it is the same from time to time without having in it the same stuff; and when it acts, it acts as a whole, and *as if* it were trying to preserve its own existence and that of an endless series of individuals like itself. The activities of its life consist, in terms of Spencer's definition, in the "continuous adjustment of internal relations to external relations": if the outer world changes, the organism changes in response, and in such wise as to keep itself intact.

The organism appears to be interested in itself; the *mind* adds the *fact of interest* to this appearance of interest. Characteristic of mind is that awareness of benefit or injury which we call pleasure or pain. It is not certain that there are any organisms without this awareness; it is not certain that the tree is indifferent to being cut down. But it is certain that some organisms are not indifferent, namely, those that are 'conscious.' And higher animals at least, in addition to being simply aware and seeking or avoiding, 'think,' i. e., form ideas of objects, make theories about their natures, conceive purposes and execute plans. The term 'mind' includes this whole gamut of conscious and intentional activities. Now the puzzle for naturalism is first, how a world of non-living things could have produced the living, self-preserving things; and second, how the fact of self-preservation becomes the awareness of self-preservation. For there is all the

difference in the world between an action and the knowledge of that action: the knowledge or awareness of it seems pure extra! And there are no assignable intermediaries between the unknowing action and the knowing action; let us say, between an arrow mechanically driven to the target and a mythical arrow which should intend and try to reach the target, and experience satisfaction when lodged in the bull's eye. Or can you think of such intermediaries?

This is the point at which the theory of evolution comes to the rescue of the incomplete view of naturalism. It proposes to explain the origin of life and of mind. Mind you, Darwin's theory made no such attempt: his work was limited to changes within the different forms of life,—the origin of species, the descent of man. He took life for granted, assuming that life always comes from life; but he broke down the lines between species and thus between lower forms of life and higher forms. It remained for a generalized theory of evolution to break down the line between the non-living and the living, the mental and the non-mental.

This generalized theory we owe chiefly to Herbert Spencer. He assembled the scattered scientific work of his day into a picture so vast, and so impressive in its cumulation of details corroborating the universal law of development through "differentiation and integration," that it became

much easier to believe that the remaining difficulties, if they were not surmounted by Spencer himself, would eventually be resolved. The line between the non-living and the living was primarily for the biologists to deal with in conjunction with the chemists. Since 1827, when Wöhler synthesized urea in his laboratory at Giessen, confidence had increased that at least all the special processes of physiology can be understood as extensions of chemical law.* It could easily appear to Spencer that the difference between living and non-living had already become a matter of the degree of complexity of the molecule of protoplasm, and of the high instability of compounds of nitrogen. (Whether these scientific researches take care of the peculiar self-preserving *form* of the activities of organic life, the student must carefully consider for himself. Ostwald, Natural Philosophy, has given some attention to this question, which most naturalists overlook. Jacques Loeb, Physiology of the Brain, traces the activities of the simpler organisms to 'tropisms,' direct reactions to light, heat, pressure, salinity, etc.†) As for the line between the non-mental and the mental, this offered Spencer some perplexity. He was at first inclined to regard consciousness as a

* For sketch of the salient points in discovering the chemical basis of physiology, see Jos. Needham's article, Mechanistic Biology, in Science, Religion and Reality; also J. A. Thompson, Concerning Evolution, pp. 42–51.

† See an article by R. L. Duffus, entitled Jacques Loeb, Mechanist, in Century, July, 1924.

form of energy,—one in the series of transformations which energy can undergo, as from heat to electricity, to light, to translatory motion. But mental energy does not seem to admit of measurement, as all the other forms of energy do, in terms of the mass and velocity of moving particles. For this and other reasons, he later considered consciousness as an *accompaniment* of changes in the brain, a rather inexplicable accompaniment which we have to accept as being there. The mind, he thought, could be understood as a highly complex system of minute feelings "similar in nature to those we know as nervous shocks": but he did not mean by this that a "nervous shock" (which is a physical fact) is identical with a feeling (which is a mental fact); so that it still remains a mystery how the mental elements happen to accompany these nervous events. Ernst Haeckel, in The Riddle of the Universe, solves the question very simply by using the magical word 'gradually.' "Consciousness," he says, "has been gradually evolved from the psychic reflex activity,"*—reflex activity being in his view 'psychic' but not conscious, a conception which it requires a certain agility to encompass. Whether you find yourself able, by the aid, perhaps, of current theories of the 'subconscious,' to make use of such a bridge from the inanimate to the animate, I cannot tell; but I point out that this is a critical

* The Riddle of the Universe, ch. vii; Psychic gradations.

point, perhaps the critical point, in any theory of evolution which offers itself as support to naturalism.

There can be no doubt that within the animal kingdom the mind has evolved along with the evolution of the body. Darwin offered important evidence for this fact (as in Origin of Species, ch. vii, and in Expression of the Emotions, 1872); and a series of able investigators in Comparative Psychology, George Romanes, Lloyd Morgan, Max Verworn, Loeb and others have pressed the enquiry at what point in the organic series we can assume that consciousness arises, and what its primitive form is. These researches labor, as one can readily see, under the disadvantage that consciousness is invisible, and that the farther away we get from the human stage of mentality the less there is in the way of expression which we can safely interpret as evidence of the presence of mind. We can only say that if, as a matter of principle, we are satisfied that mind can arise out of the inanimate world, all such researches aid us in picturing the stages of its growth from its rudimentary beginnings,* which still remain speculative.

26. *Emergent evolution.* Since Darwin and Spencer wrote, many changes have been made in our views of the manner in which evolution takes

* See L. T. Hobhouse, Mind in Evolution; Lloyd Morgan, Instinct and Experience, ch. iv.

place. The word 'gradually' has happily been submerged: many steps of development, it is now seen, may have occurred abruptly, by 'mutation.' It is conceivable that mind may thus have entered the scene.

It has long been known that there are two kinds of effect in nature, which George Henry Lewes distinguished as 'resultants' and 'emergents.'* The resultants are the effects which we are able to deduce from the causes; as when we say that the weight of salt is the sum of the weights of the sodium and the chlorine that combine to produce it. The emergents are the unpredictable effects, which, so to speak, supervene together with the resultants; as the *taste* of the salt, its crystalline form and color, which lacking all resemblance to the properties of either sodium or chlorine seem to be something quite new and additional to the situation. Such emergent qualities seem to depend upon the way of arrangement or composition of the ingredients.

Now may it be that life and mind 'emerge' in this abrupt way whenever in the rearrangements of physical elements the right kind of order or form happens to be struck out? This is the suggestion of Mr. Lloyd Morgan (Emergent Evolution, 1923). Mr. Morgan himself is not a philo-

* Problems of Life and Mind, 1875, 412. Quoted by C. Lloyd Morgan in Journal of Philosophical Studies, January, 1929, 23, in an article, The Case for Emergent Evolution, which deserves careful study.

sophical naturalist: he believes, rather, that in the universe at large there is some mental cause for the emergence of consciousness. He regarded 'emergent' as merely a word for the scientific observer, to mark the empirical fact that something new had occurred for whose explanation he had no further responsibility than to note the conditions under which it appears. But the word was a good one; there are so many cases of emergence in nature that it seemed to amount to a new law, namely, that under the right circumstances unpredictable qualities arise and continue to exist. (Does this seem to the reader like making the absence of an explanation serve for an explanation, by providing it with a name, and finding numerous cases of it? It is some reply, not wholly satisfactory perhaps, to point out that most so-called laws of nature do that very thing. We do not understand any single case of gravitation; but when all bodies attract each other in the same unexplained way, which we can exactly formulate, we have a command of the How, if not of the Why, of the whole group of phenomena,—and with this How, modern science regards its work as finished.) Thus Mr. Morgan found his conception immediately put to the uses of naturalistic evolution, as in Mr. Alexander's Space, Time and Deity.* Mr. R. W. Sellars in Evolu-

* Published in 1920, and acknowledging indebtedness to earlier suggestions of Mr. Morgan.

tionary Naturalism, employs this same idea. The picture of evolution thus presented restores the older conception of a series of *steps* in which life, mind, reason mark off clearly distinguished groups of phenomena. Does it appear to you that this way of arraying the facts of evolution surmounts the difficulty with which Spencer and Haeckel struggled, under the supposition that mind must be introduced by gradual stages?

It has at least this advantage. The older conceptions conveyed the impression that whatever is evolved is composed of, and therefore in reality *is*, the more primitive thing out of which it came: the mind *is* nothing but its ancestry, the dust. To the emergent evolutionist, each new thing exists in its own right, and if not as real as the elements from whose arrangement it emerges, cannot be reduced to them. The 'nothing-but' phrase ceases to be appropriate.

27. *Naturalism and human nature.* After all, the evolution of mind may be taken as secondary to the question what mind is as we now find it. If naturalism can give a sufficient account of human nature, as it is, there will be no final obstacle in determining how it came to be. Psychology, today, is the chief battle-ground of naturalism.

Since the middle of the nineteenth century, psychology has been written largely from the standpoint of physiology. That is to say, the mind has

been treated as a function of the brain, an organ in an organism, and subject like the rest of the body to the laws of cause and effect which include that body in the circuits of physical nature. At first the naturalist had one main instrument of explanation, the 'reflex arc' (q. v.): the mind as an active affair was considered a phenomenon of stimulus and response. When the finger touches a hot iron there is an instant and mechanical withdrawal: the response takes that particular form because the nervous current is routed through the system, along an inborn path of least resistance. Instincts are more complicated sequences of behavior into whose composition a number of reflex arcs may enter; and instincts modified by experience shape our habits, and thereby the character of the mature individual. Just how this simple scheme accounts for memory, anticipation, reasoning, and the higher mental processes is naturally a matter for much careful enquiry.*

During recent years another instrument of explanation has become available, in the form of the chemistry of the blood as affected by the glands of internal secretion, the so-called endocrine glands. It had long been known—indeed, it was the basis of much ancient psychology—that

* An ingeniously worked-out plan of human psychology strictly on the reflex-arc pattern may be found in Max Meyer, Fundamental Laws of Human Behavior, 1911. On the theory of Instinct see James, Psychology; McDougall, Social Psychology; Hocking, Human Nature and Its Remaking.

the emotions are governed largely by visceral disturbances. Recent experimental work has brought to light how profoundly these changes in the body are affected by the adrenal, interstitial, thyroid and other secretions. By proper administration of thyroid extract a cretin may be brought much nearer to normality; and by stopping the dosage he may be dropped back again. There is thus much justification for the view that the chemical balance of the body is immediately reflected in the temper and the tonus of personality.* There is rather less justification for the extravagant expectations which have been built on this discovery, as by Mr. Russell and Mr. Trotzky, the latter of whom suggests that in time we shall be able by proper chemical feeding to lift the level of the racial mentality so that all men will stand in a scale from Newton's level upward! Unfortunately no drug has yet been found which will raise human intelligence above its present normal, so that it will stay up.

But we cannot require of psychology that it change human nature: its first business is to understand human nature. And beyond doubt, as a result of the work of physiological psychology, many things about the mind are better understood. The visible proof of this is in the applications of psychology. Mental diseases are cured.

* Dr. Berman's title, "The Glands Regulating Personality," states the case over-emphatically.

Useful proposals are made to education, to industry, to advertising, to political life,—to every situation in which human beings can be *managed.* And if we can thus learn of the mind through the behavior which we can observe and measure, is it not reasonable to assume that the acting organism, with its marvellously sensitive nervous mechanism, is equivalent, for scientific purposes, to the mind itself? This is the position of behaviorism, the extreme development of naturalistic psychology. The organism can be observed; the organism has evolved: why worry further about the evolution of consciousness? For that matter, why worry about consciousness at all?

The question for us, however, is not whether psychology has thrown a great flood of light upon human nature. The question is simply whether the sort of psychology which investigates the mind solely as an object in nature, subject to laws of cause and effect, can tell *the whole truth* about the mind. Remembering that 'the mind' is something of which each man has a specimen close at hand; and that he has a right to judge any statements about what it is;—is that what you are,—a mechanism among mechanisms?

28. *Naturalism explains religion.* Naturalism would not be so convincing as it is if it merely sat in the stronghold of natural law and declared all other outlooks on the universe superfluous. No

one convinces his opponent simply by ruling him out of court,—this is one reason for the comparative fruitlessness of much argumentation. To be convincing, one must step onto the mental ground of his opponent and show why it is that he thinks as he does, where he makes his mistake. The evidence for naturalism will not be wholly satisfying, therefore, unless it can explain why men have been religious, or have taken the spiritualistic view of the world. But this, by way of psychology, naturalism is quite prepared to do. The naturalistic psychology of religion explains religion as a very natural—and for a time very serviceable—human mistake.

The function of ideas (or of whatever corresponds to ideas in the nervous centres) is to guide behavior: they stand between stimulus and response. The perception of a red glow on the prairie arouses the idea of fire and guides for man and beast the response of flight. The true idea aids survival; the false idea leads to waste effort or to death. A belief being a complex group of ideas, we may say that animals whose brains produce true beliefs will tend to survive. And sometimes a mixture of truth and error will do this work of aiding survival, if the error is not operative. Thus, so long as men's journeys were of restricted range, the assumption that the earth is flat worked as well as the truer notion.

Now spiritualism has been useful in this way.

It has offered *encouragement* at the time when man needed it most. The great mental task of early times, if man was to be markedly different from the animals, was that he should be able to see ahead, be interested in the future and plan for it: he could then begin to live by his dreams, using his creative imagination—perhaps his most distinctive faculty—with effect. Religion kept alive in him the hope that he could, by aid of the divine power, surmount his obstacles and work out a better order of life. It thus held him to the task of mastering nature until the great primary difficulties attending subsistence, shelter and the like had actually been mastered. It developed his imagination and confirmed the habit of devotion to an ideal.

It aided *social solidarity*, making possible that respect for custom which was necessary if men were to reach any common ground of social life. It sanctioned and idealized rulership, an essential first stage in state-building. Note that this idealizing of common things, which may seem so wild a departure from the cold facts, is often nearer the truth than the realistic description. When Mr. J. C. Gray describes the Supreme Court as "half a dozen elderly men, sitting on a platform behind a green or red cloth, with very probably not commanding wills or powerful physique . . . some of them, conceivably, of very limited intelligence,"* he is intentionally omit-

* Nature and Sources of the Law, ed. 1921, 121, 84.

ting from the picture the powerful tradition of the public law of the land which operates through these men. Until humanity could recognize these intangible but actual elements of a working society it needed the schooling in deference to the unseen which religion supplied.

Further, religion created a *technique of enthusiasm.* Through its ritual excitements it trained the effusive emotionality of early man into relatively orderly channels. It is on this account that religion after much groping became the home of the infancy of all the fine arts,—though it is not altogether certain that this product of religion can pose as an aid to survival.

But what was at first an aid may, in later stages of progress, become a hindrance, or even a poison. Encouragement may become a sort of coddling. Religion has been regarded by Freudian psychologists as a belated moral infantilism, whereby in the maturity of the race, when we ought to be ready to face the problems of existence in all their harsh verity, men still persist in dreaming of a benevolent heavenly paternal roof, which personally shields them from the severest blows of fate. The support of custom may become (as it soon did become) a congealing of custom; so that the very function for opening the future became a vice for fixing the bondage of the past. The interest in the ideal may become an indulgence in abstract contemplation, to the robbing of human

life. And the arts, one by one, have had to claim liberation from their dominating parent. The secularization movements of history, ending with the still incomplete secularization of politics, indicate this phase of the warfare, not of science, but of the arts with religion. Thus religion takes its place in the program of naturalistic evolution, and we are invited to consider it not so much disproved as outgrown, with all due gratitude for its former beneficent rôle.

Auguste Comte (1798–1857), French positivist, has given a vivid expression to this view of the rôle of religion. He teaches* that men's views of the world naturally run through three stages. The first stage is theological: events are explained by referring them to divine powers. The second stage is metaphysical: events are explained by referring them to separate energies, life by a vital force, fire by a principle of heat, falling bodies by a heavy principle, and so on. The third stage is the 'positive' stage: events are explained by referring them to causes, i. e., to previous events on which they follow according to definite laws. This kind of explanation does not take us out of the field of observable and measurable facts, and is the highest stage of human intellect. The positive stage of thought does not destroy all that mankind has cherished under the name of religion; only, it substitutes for the supernatural

* Cours de philosophie positive, 1830.

being, whom no one can discover, the Great Being with whom we have to do at all times, and whom we can loyally serve, Humanity.*

Thus, when any man judges his dreams to be dreams, he discards them, though regretfully, and girds himself to face the literal facts of the universe with sternness and courage. The idea of God is seen, by the eye schooled in the scientific temper, to be a visionary form of the permanently needful devotion to ideal social ends. The wish for immortality is seen as a projection of the impulse of youth for the affirmation of life. To perceive the psychology of our beliefs is to gain detachment from them.

29. In nothing of what has preceded has naturalism undertaken to prove its case. It has simply appealed to sober judgment. To summarize, it submits as in its favor:

Our common sense or intuition of the reality of physical things;

The tangible and measurable character of the objects it operates with in its explanations. They give a definiteness and a clarity to language which contrast favorably with the often cloudy vagueness of the spiritualist. The materialist is peculiarly fortunate in this respect; for anybody can imagine an atom in the midst of space, if it

*See selections from Comte in Rand. Also John Stuart Mill, Auguste Comte and Positivism, pp. 1-32 and 124-148.

is a solid particle of the Newtonian model. This clarity is an augury of good-faith and mental fraternity;

The completeness of its explanations, having in mind also the minute accuracy which has come with the quantitative phase of science;

In particular, its explanation of the human mind through a causal psychology, and of the transitory function of religion in history. The temper of naturalism was formerly arrogant and bitter; something of the scorn of the partisan fighting against entrenched bigotry appears in the work of Haeckel, and occasionally in the more genial writing of Huxley. But in Romanes and Spencer and later writers, one finds regretful acceptance of the bleaker view of the world which the evidence seems to them to require;

The simplicity and unity of the world-view, not cluttered up with supernatural intrusions and indefinite fringes. It allows concentration on the human task. "It sternly implies the need for securing the finest conditions for human development in the world of here and now. Misery and want cannot be excused by considering them part of an inscrutable plan." Nor are we justified in deferring to another life the justice which it is our duty to create in this.

30. *Naturalism in the history of thought.*

As a tendency in every man's mind, naturalism

would be expected to show itself in every period of history. It would gain clear expression wherever men had reached the sense of a reliable order of natural law.

Accordingly (to mention a few notable names) we find it in the Greek world, in the philosophy of Democritus, and in that of his Roman disciple, Lucretius, whose great poem, De rerum natura, (about 60 B. C.) is a passionate appeal for a passionless view of the world. (See extracts from Munro's translation of Lucretius in Bakewell's Source Book, pp. 305–315.)

At the beginning of the modern era, Thomas Hobbes undertook to explain the mind as a case of matter in motion. Sensation is a direct effect of outer motions on the nerves; and as "motion produceth nothing but motion," sensation must be a kind of motion. Then imagination and memory are "decaying sense"; and reason a train of memories. (See extracts from Hobbes, Leviathan, 1651, in Rand, Modern Classical Philosophers, pp. 57–76, being chapters i–v.)

Eighteenth-century France saw a striking development of materialism. René Descartes, often called the founder of modern philosophy, had already taught (Principles of Philosophy, 1644) that the body of animals is an automatic mechanism, without consciousness; and, as one historian comments, "For a long time it was fashionable among zealous Cartesians to torture animals in a

frivolous spirit, in order to show that their theory was seriously meant." He thought that man was a machine so far as his body is concerned; but that the mind was a distinct substance, capable of acting on the body.* This reservation of the human mind was criticised by La Mettrie (1748), who wrote, with the vast approval of Frederick the Great, a book entitled l'Homme Machine. (Translated by G. C. Bussey, Open Court, 1912, under the title Man a Machine.)

But the great era of naturalism is, as one would expect, the century of Darwin and Spencer, when natural law was first successfully applied to the world of living organisms, and the principles of evolution in biology were extended to the history of the universe. The nineteenth century saw the notable works of Ludwig Büchner (Kraft und Stoff, Force and Matter), Herbert Spencer (Synthetic Philosophy), Ernst Haeckel (Riddle of the Universe), T. H. Huxley (Essays), and Friedrich Nietzsche. For a clear-cut materialist, Büchner is perhaps the best example. Wilhelm Ostwald, physical chemist, in his Natural Philosophy (Holt, 1910), reduces matter to energy; he is therefore not technically a materialist, but an energist. The most systematic expression of the philosophy of natural evolution is that of Herbert Spencer in First Principles. (Selec-

* Descartes's views will be considered more at length under the head of Dualism, §§ 108-132 below.

tions in Rand. The beginner would do better, however, to have the full text before him, sketching the chapters in Part II at the first reading, by omitting something of the vast bulk of illustration with which Spencer reinforces his argument, and paying particular attention to the last three chapters, Equilibration, Dissolution, Summary and Conclusion. Note carefully how Spencer brings the mind into the order of evolution. How Spencer deals with religion will be found in chapters i, ii and v of Part I.)

(Büchner, Force and Matter, is a short book which can be gathered in its main argument very quickly. The chapters most worth attention are those labelled Force and Matter, Creation, Purpose in Nature, Brain and Soul, Free Will, Conclusion.)

(Ernst Haeckel, Riddle of the Universe: chapters 1, 6, 10, 11, 12, 15, will outline the argument.)

(T. H. Huxley, Lay Sermons, xiv, On Descartes's Discourse; Life and Letters, I, 241-244, etc.)

The nineteenth century seems to us now a period of naturalistic classics. Physics aided by mathematics provided the ideal of an established scientific method; and the notion of a set of equations which should describe the law of the behavior of all atoms in all space throughout all time seemed not impossibly out of reach. The

twentieth century has brought a profound revolution in our conception of the ultimate facts of physics. In the broadest sense, this makes no difference to naturalism, which is not committed to any particular physical doctrine but only to an acceptance of the physical universe, whatever it may prove to be, as the outline of nature. But the world picture itself becomes less definite. Twentieth-century naturalism is more complex, more varied, less typical, less confident. It frequently appears under the guise of a highly technical type of philosophy which we shall later consider, realism. A few examples:

Bertrand Russell, Problems of Philosophy; Scientific Method in Philosophy. Russell's writing has distinguished clarity, vigor, and wit. His earlier writings, done in close connection with mathematical logic, are serious.

George Santayana's Skepticism and Animal Faith is a work of great charm and less lucidity by an eminent poet and master of expression.

R. W. Sellars, Evolutionary Naturalism: a text-book, solid, incisive, schematic. It is not poetic.

Chapter IV

THE LOGIC OF NATURALISM

31. The foregoing arguments in favor of naturalism, I repeat, are not proofs. They are appeals to judgment.

In fact, there can be no proof of naturalism. How could one prove that nothing but nature exists? The only way in which anything can be proved non-existent is to show that it is impossible: thus a centaur is impossible, under conditions of terrestrial physiology, hence centaurs are non-existent on this earth. And there are certain kinds of god which may be shown impossible, at least under natural laws. But unless we assume that these natural laws rule the entire universe, which would be begging the question, we cannot prove that even the gods of Homer's Olympus are impossible everywhere. The non-existence of a spiritual God, or of another world, or of a future life, cannot be proved.

But there is a logical side to the case for naturalism. It consists in refuting the attempts which have been made in the past to prove that supernature does exist.

32. What would you regard as the strongest grounds that could be given for a belief in God?

Apart from intuitive and pragmatic reasons, there are three main grounds of a rational order, which have been elicited during the long defensive contest between spiritualism and naturalism, and which reappear in all arguments on this subject.

First, there is the argument that *nature requires an author.* As one student has put the matter, "There must be something all-powerful somewhere that created the universe in the first place." Another, "It seems required by reason that some great power is responsible for the existence of the universe, and since man has found no satisfactory explanation of the beginning of things in nature itself, I believe that power to be God." In brief, the world of nature is considered not self-sufficient: it shows signs of dependence on something beyond itself. The dependent implies an independent being. That independent and self-sufficient being is God. This argument, interested in origins, the first cause of things, creation, has been called the *cosmological argument.*

Second, there is the argument that *the order and beauty of nature* could not be accidental, but *imply a mind* that appreciated them, and meant to bring them into existence. Thus, "The material universe, which always acts by fixed law, supposes a law-giver outside itself. No one can make a law unless he has intelligence. The creator is therefore an intelligent being." "Common-sense tells one that the beauty and co-ordination of Na-

ture could no more have sprung into being by itself than a watch with its intricate parts scattered could spring into motion"; "Who but a god could have worked out the myriad laws of nature in all their exact perfection?" This argument, interested not so much in the bare facts of the world as in their value and fitness, has been called the *teleological argument*. It is the argument from the design to the designer.

There is a third ground which more rarely comes to light. It is the argument that *the idea of God somehow guarantees its own truth*. "There seems to be something in the notion of a supreme being which cannot be false or illusory." "I cannot believe that the idea of God would have occurred to mankind if there had not been reality behind it." This argument also has received strong expression in the history of philosophy; but it has taken many forms, as if it were difficult to capture in logical terms, and were somehow more truly stated in the indefinite form. There is in the idea of God a peculiarity which sets it apart from all other ideas, and requires me to believe that its object is truly existent. What is that peculiarity?

Some mediæval schoolmen thought it 'pure Being': God is pure Being, and pure Being necessarily exists.

Anselm of Canterbury (1033–1109) thought it 'perfection.' He argued that the idea of the

perfect being (not 'a' perfect being) necessarily involves the existence of that being. For if the idea is a mere idea or fancy it lacks something of that full perfection which it would attain if its object also existed. Hence we contradict ourselves if we think of the most perfect being as a mere idea. We must think of it as existing.

Spinoza (1632–1677) also thought it 'perfection.' Perfection, he held, carries with it a power to exist; if we think of the absolute beginning or origin of things, perfection would assert its inherent power to be,—nothing could resist it. "The perfection of a thing does not annul its existence, but on the contrary asserts it. Imperfection, on the other hand, does annul it. Therefore we cannot be more certain of the existence of anything than of the existence of a being absolutely infinite or perfect—that is, of God."*

In these and other ways philosophers have tried to show that the idea of God contains our standard of reality; and we can never accept the suggestion that this standard may be 'merely subjective,' for it is only our standard of 'objective reality' which could lead us to judge any idea as subjective. The idea of God then, by itself, requires belief in the existence of God. This has been called the *ontological argument*.

Do these three arguments exhaust what can be said in the way of attempting a rational proof of the existence of God?

* Ethics, proposition xi, note. Bohn edition, p. 53.

33. Naturalism undertakes to show that all these arguments are fallacious. They have been criticised by many thinkers who are not naturalists. No one has attacked them more trenchantly than Kant. (See J. Watson, Selections from Kant, pp. 202–222.)

As for the last mentioned argument, the ontological, Kant voices the opinion of the majority when he judges that there is nothing in it. You have an idea of a perfect circle; that is, the definition of a circle: but this perfection is no guarantee of the existence of the perfect circle. On the contrary, the perfect is precisely what does not exist. Existence adds nothing to the perfection of an idea. Perfection is a quality: if a perfect rose could be translated from idea to actuality, its perfection would not be improved nor in any way changed. Has Kant met the ontological argument in its full strength?

The cosmological argument errs in making an illicit use of the idea of *cause*. The origins of things are their causes; and their causes are always in some previous state of nature. The origin of the hen is in the egg, and the origin of the egg is a preceding hen. Trace it back as far as you like, to the original protoplasmic slime, or to the original nebula: you are *never referred outside of nature* for your origin. The relation of cause to effect is the very essence of natural happening.

We could never, therefore, be referred to a supernatural being for a cause of anything that happens. Nor yet for the cause of "all things,"—if that phrase has any assignable meaning.

Creation is a different matter, quite different from causation; for creation implies the production of the very stuff of the world. But clearly no argument from causality can help us in reaching the creative source of things, if there is any such source. For causality only plies between one state and another of existing things.

The wiser naturalists do not imagine that they have avoided all mental difficulty in thus rebuking the tendency of the mind to use the causal ladder to climb out of nature. If they insist that the ladder is really a chain of causes leading backward into the past *ad infinitum*, they are asserting in effect that the world had *no beginning*. The demand that we believe in an infinitude of past time is a baffling one. An infinite series is one that never ends; but if there was no beginning, each present moment is the end of a finished infinite series. Is this conceivable? We have here a mental dilemma (or, as Kant called it, an *antinomy*): the world must have had a beginning, and it cannot have had a beginning. Whichever alternative we choose, we face the inconceivable.

Herbert Spencer fully recognizes this difficulty. He attributes it to the limitations of the human mind: the mind, he holds, is fitted for thinking in

terms of relations, such as causality,—it can link one fragment of the world to another; but it is not fitted for thinking the whole. Our knowledge is relative, not absolute; it is scientific, not metaphysical. Hence, when we try to reach absolute beginnings, we are faced with "alternative impossibilities of thought" (First Principles, Part I). There are only three alternatives possible for the origin of the world: it is self-existent, or self-caused, or caused by an external agency. And each of these alternatives is really without meaning to our minds. We cannot conceive that a thing exists in its own right without any source beyond itself; we cannot conceive self-creation, for that implies that the thing exists before it exists; and to refer it to an external creator merely defers the question. For we have to ask, Whence the creator? And that question, as Kant already recognized, is "the abyss of human reason."

If, then, the assumption of a God does not explain the origin of the world, the cosmological argument loses its entire point.

34. As for the teleological argument, which pretends to see in the order and fitness of nature a benevolent purpose, that argument has been under attack since the beginning of modern times. Lord Bacon exposed the fallacy of referring natural events and arrangements to "final causes," that is, to an assumed purpose. If we explain the

good harvest by the will of a good God, it becomes inexplicable that the next harvest is a poor one. The hypothesis of purpose cannot be used to predict the future and is thus, as Bacon put it, "barren, like a virgin consecrated to God." And Spinoza termed it the "refuge of ignorance,"* because of the idle habit of referring to the will of God whatever we cannot otherwise explain. Further, it was felt on all sides that the motives attributed to God by such explanations were paltry and unworthy. If the earth is not the centre of the universe, neither is man the centre of the value of the universe; and the fitness of the world for man, so far as it is fit, is not to be attributed to the supreme interest of God in the human being. Nor have we any right to forget the degree of unfitness in the world; its evil, ugliness, and waste. If from the world as we find it, we try to infer an all-good designer, we are attempting to rise higher than our source. We are, as Kant pointed out, really attributing existence to our preconceived idea of God, that is, making use of the 'ontological argument.'

The appeals to design in the world of animal life, those admiring meditations which have always been excited by the marvellous structure of the eye and the other sense organs, the protective devices, and the instincts (see for example Fénélon, The Existence of God),—Darwin's great demon-

* Ethics, prop. xxvi, appendix, Bohn edition, p. 79.

stration that the animal was fitted to the world and not the world to the animal, and that the fitting process could be understood by the ordinary operation of causal laws, more effectively banished these than the criticism of Kant had done.

But in any case, the teleological argument is not a real argument, for it fails to put forward a genuine hypothesis unless we have some conception of the process by which God, having designed the world, then brings it into being. Here we light upon the difficulties of the problem of origins which the cosmological argument brought to evidence, and are forced once more to face the limitations of the human intellect.

35. Unless there is something wrong with these criticisms, we should judge with naturalism that these arguments for the existence of God are not substantial. There may be other arguments. There may be grounds not capable of being put into argumentative form. There may be some aspects of supernature not dependent on the existence of God. The will might be free, the soul might be immortal, even if God did not exist. These questions deserve examination, and have been examined in the discussions of naturalistic writers. But since the belief in God is the kernel of all supernaturalism, we have before us the logic of naturalism at its best.

Chapter V

NATURALISTIC ETHICS

36. If we cancel belief in God, and in the concern of an all-powerful and all-holy being for righteousness, what becomes of the standards of human morality?

Of course, for the naturalist, the horizon is rimmed by death, both for the individual and the race. But death is no more in the immediate foreground for him than for others. His idea of the wise conduct of life depends on what his reason shows him of cause and effect in producing happiness or misery. He has nothing to fear from the wrath of God; he has still to be mindful of the wrath of society and of his own nature.

His motives are obviously simplified; his conduct need not be essentially altered. He is not troubled to do anything for the glory of God nor for the love of God; and there is no reasonable sentiment in him of gratitude or loyalty to the physical universe which brought him forth, and will some day blot him out. But he cannot destroy the instinctive aspirations of his heredity. If he cares for science, he will still care for it. If his nature is sociable, he will still wish to please his fellow men. If he is sensitive to beauty and refine-

ment, he will still cultivate harmony and decency in his behavior.

According to Plato, moral rightness (or 'justice') is simply mental health, the kind of disposition which gives every man his due and every function of the mind its proportionate share in the government of behavior: on this showing, only the just man can be happy, for the unjust man, like the sick man, is incapable of the ordinary satisfactions of life.* The good life has its intrinsic recommendations in the nature of things, quite apart from rewards added by gods or men.

37. It is true that the first effect of abandoning a belief in God and the future life may be a sense of liberation. "God is dead," cries Nietzsche, "*alles ist erlaubt*,—everything is permitted!" Nature and natural impulse are not evil; away with shame and repression; away with discipline and restraint. The ethics of the free man will be the ethics of "self-expression."

Whoever takes this direction, or that of Omar Khayyam, the cult of self-centred joy and oblivion, is likely to incur the censure of other naturalists. They will point out to him, in terms not wholly different from Plato's, that there is a discipline which belongs to nature itself. Further, he cannot turn his back on the needs of humanity and be wholly satisfied with himself. Epicurus and

* Republic, Book iv. Plato is not a naturalist.

Lucretius, with no remoter goal than the natural satisfaction of life, found the chief advantage of banishing the gods to an innocuous distance (they still professed a nominal belief in their existence) the fact that they had overcome the haunting fear of divine punishment and of death: their code of ethics we should call somewhat austere, although the word "epicurean" has gained a very different connotation in our common speech. They believed that the enduring pleasures of life were the most satisfying, and that the more intense pleasures were deceptive, being both transitory and attended by pain and disgust. A life of leisure, friendship, and the cultivation of philosophy was to them the wise choice. (See Bakewell, Source Book, 297-306.)

38. Modern naturalists have made systematic attempts to apply their world-view to wise conduct. Herbert Spencer's Data of Ethics is one of the outstanding essays. Spencer argues that men can be happy only if they fall in with the evident trend of nature in evolution (we cannot say the 'intention' of nature), and work with nature for the preservation and increase of life. This means care for one's health and for the development of one's mental powers to their highest capacity; it means trying to abolish war and all those conflicts which involve the subtraction of life and energy from both contestants; it means the replacement

of a military society by an industrial society; it means free competition in that society, so that the best men come to the top; and it means the general growth of sympathy to such a point that one derives as much gratification from the pleasure of others as from his own pleasures, and egoism and altruism are reconciled.

39. Nietzsche draws from the same premises a very different picture. He finds Spencer's ideal too tame. Nature makes for evolution, it is true; but its means is the destruction of the unfit. The strong and vital elements of society must assert themselves, not for their own sakes more than for the sake of the future. Christianity has been a detriment to the race by cultivating the amiable and sympathetic tempers. Instead of urging us to love others as we love ourselves, Nietzsche would urge us to be ruthless to ourselves as we should be to others. The Superman can only be brought forth by the *Untergang* of the less worthy; and if that less worthy be oneself, it is one's piety to yield to the better. Relentless self-mastery is the way of happiness. "*Geist ist das Leben, das selber ins Leben schneidet.*"

40. Huxley (in Evolution and Ethics) gives up the attempt to find a guide for ethics in the processes of sub-human nature. He finds that all civilization, like the work of the gardener, is a

fight with the weeds. The social process cuts across the process of natural selection; and the social aspects of human nature must thrive, even in defiance of the method of struggle for survival. Huxley's essay is worth weighing in view of Nietzsche's powerful appeal for the Darwinian type of morals.

41. In sum, then, while the moral codes of naturalists differ, naturalism does not leave morals without support.* It does not necessarily turn mankind back to the pig sty, nor reverse the direction of social advance. Only, its ethics lacks the vista of eternity, and the resonance of a divine concern in its inward vitality.† It is man's gesture of heroism on the scaffold of a universe which will eventually write a cipher as the sum of all his works.

* We return to this question in chapter XXVI.
† See George Herbert Palmer, The Field of Ethics, final chapter.

dimental

Chapter VI

NATURALISM EXAMINED

42. Naturalism as a type of philosophy is now before us. Its case is undoubtedly a strong one. What is the strongest part of it? To my mind, it is the completeness of its program of explanation.

43. The advantage which naturalism enjoyed in the nineteenth century in clarity and imaginableness and the consistency of its scientific structure in all its parts,—that advantage has vanished. With the advent of a new outlook in physics, which we may date roughly from Roentgen's discovery of the x-rays in 1895, a discovery which gave us the instrument for exploring the sub-atomic levels of the universe, physical conceptions have entered upon a period for which 'transition' would be too tame a word. These changes, so far as they affect our world-picture, may be resumed roughly as follows:

a. The simple and unchangeable atom has shown itself to be a minute world of much internal complexity, capable of composition and decomposition, and of turning on occasion into some other kind of atom. The discoveries of the electron and of radio-activity have revealed motion and

change in what was formerly thought eternally stable.

b. The fixed difference between matter and energy is no longer clear. Nothing is more obvious to common sense and to nineteenth-century physics than that you can change the rate of motion of a body *ad libitum* without changing the mass of the body. In taking an inventory of the physical universe, you had always two quantities to consider, the amount of matter, and the amount of motion: these were independent facts. No matter could ever be created or destroyed. The same of energy, a function of mass, motion and position. There was a 'conservation' of matter, and another 'conservation' of energy. Now it appears that matter and radiant energy are convertible one into the other; and it is not inconceivable—or rather it is not physically impossible whether we can conceive it or not—that the substance of the physical world is being transported gradually from place to place, taking wings in the form of radiation, and being precipitated in remote regions as new-born atoms. By a sort of universal convection or Gulf-Streaming, the resources of the Sidereal systems are forever redistributing themselves with the speed of light. If there is any conservation, it must be of some union of matter and energy rather than of either alone.

c. The law of continuity is in difficulties. There is hardly any principle of science of greater dig-

nity than this law: *natura non facit saltum.* If a body is to get from one place to another, it must go through a continuous series of intermediate places, except in dreams and fairy tales. If a revolving fly-wheel is to increase or reduce its speed, it must do so by going through all intermediate speeds. But we are now asked (by such theories as Planck's theory of quanta, and by such facts as the Compton effect, q. v.) to consider that periodic motions may be 'granular' or discontinuous like the series of whole numbers, that electrons may jump from one orbit to another without at any time being anywhere between, that radiant energy may go off into space in a series of distinct darts at once wave-wise and lump-wise. We are not asked to picture these events, we are simply warned that we may be required to believe them. Any *a priori* prejudices we may have in behalf of the continuity of all changes must be prepared to yield as gracefully as possible.

d. The independence of time and space is likewise under suspicion,—since the publication of Minkowski's memoir in 1908. Not that time is to be considered a form of space, nor space a form of time; but that space and time have to be taken together for purposes of measurement, and that how much space and how much time are occupied by any given event are questions which cannot be answered independently of one another. The the-

ory of relativity at present is to be regarded as a fundamental enquiry into the principles of physical measurements, rather than into the nature of space and time; but it has made clear that however distinct our ideas of space and time may be (can you think of time without space, or of space without time?) we must consider them one manifold for scientific purposes. And further, we must take them together with the events which, as we say, occur 'in' space and time: for apart from these events it is questionable whether space and time, as empty regions, would so much as exist.

When Herbert Spencer made up his list of "ultimate scientific ideas" he mentioned five,—space, time, matter, motion, force (to which he added consciousness, as another sort of thing),—and these five he regarded as alike inconceivable, if we ask what they are in themselves. He also held it to be unbelievable that these five are completely independent entities, and so proposed that the others are all manifestations of force, though how this could be he thought must remain unknowable. Physical science seems to be entering by necessity the region of these 'inscrutable' relationships of ultimate ideas: and in so doing makes at least so much clear, that the apparent clarity of materialism was an illusory advantage. If we explain the world in terms of physical elements we are no longer explaining the unknown

by the known, but the known by the unfamiliar and unpicturable, possibly even the unthinkable. Naturalism can no longer claim support from the human instinct to take the solid as the real.

44. Now do these puzzles of contemporary physics require radical changes in our metaphysics?

So far as they are merely the quandaries of physics, not established results, it is premature to indulge in new metaphysical stock-taking. It is certainly too early to infer, as some have hastened to do, that these changes have made naturalism itself untenable. We need to remind ourselves time and again that science does not of itself constitute philosophy. However hard the physical world may be to understand, however disturbing to our established ways of formulating it, this difficulty has nothing to do with the *reality* of the physical world, nor with the ultimate question of naturalism, whether physical nature is all there is.

With this warning, however, we may say that the very existence of these puzzles has radically altered the question which the metaphysical Sphinx puts to the human mind to-day. The clear-cut finality of the physical object, which naturalism requires, is shaken. The materialistic type of naturalism is now excluded from the possible alternatives by the progress of physics itself.

Positivism is also excluded. The physicist can

no longer say, "We are not interested in what space and time and energy are; we are only interested in the order and connection of phenomena." For the order and connection of phenomena depend a good deal on what space and time and energy are. Physics to-day once more admits metaphysics into its counsels.

And in regard to the nature of space and time, the physicist no longer says with his former assurance, "We can settle the problems of physics without reference to *the mind:* the physical world can exist by itself, whether or not there are any minds there to observe it." For it has become an integral part of the theory of relativity that 'the observer' must be taken into account before we can tell how much space or time or motion we are dealing with. This 'observer,' to be sure, is for the most part merely a recording instrument, a clock or a meter-stick. But if the facts depend on what such instruments show, and on the choice of them, the observing mind is brought into the reckoning. Thus if it is true, as Professor Bridgman says, that there is no geometry of pure space, but a geometry of meter sticks for near-by or 'tactual' space and a geometry of light waves for astronomical or 'optical' space,* then space loses its independent reality. And if "we must not talk about the age of a beam of light," nor "allow ourselves to think of events taking place in Arc-

* The Logic of Modern Physics, 67 f.

turus *now* with all the connotation attached to events taking place *here* now,"* then time ceases to have that objective reality which naturalism formerly took for granted. And if the amount and character of the physical universe are indeterminate apart from the judgments of its mentally alive observers, the world prior to the entrance of the observing minds could only be given a vague, indescribable, pre-natal sort of existence!

Thus physics itself, we may justly say, has rendered naturalism less plausible and less self-confident.

But let no one suppose that the solution of the major metaphysical problems depends on the settlement of these intricate technical questions. Fortunately the great issues of life do not require all of us to become mathematical physicists. The merits of naturalism have, for the most part, to be determined on other and more accessible grounds. Such as this:

If I am right in thinking that the strong side of naturalism is the completeness of its explanations, it becomes vulnerable at once if at any point its explanations are incomplete and *necessarily so.* Is there any such point?

45. Does naturalism explain qualities?

The world as we find it is full of color, sound,

* Op. cit., 76.

odors, tastes, touch-qualities, and the like. Causality as the eye perceives it operates between events full of these qualities: colored waves beat on colored rocks. But as scientific theory replaces crude observation, our understanding of the process changes. The color is merely our personal view of a certain vibration rate, and similarly with the sounds and other qualities which appeal to sense. In itself, the reality of nature is not colored, because it is the basis of color. Perhaps it is not even tangible, nor imaginable. The question, What does a proton look like, or feel like, has no answer. Diagrams of the atoms are confessedly mere symbols for possible spatial relationships. The thought of nature passes from the imaginable to the merely calculable. It is the totality of terms which are to be introduced into certain differential equations. It *abandons* qualities in order to *explain* qualities; and so, in itself, it approaches a pure quantity.

But the qualities are there; and if they are omitted from the idea of nature, can they really be explained?

Naturalism answers, the quality is the effect of a certain vibratory disturbance upon the nerves and brain of the organism. But the nerves and brain are themselves physical objects, and hence composed of the same ingredients as other physical bodies. If there is no color in the wave, neither is there any color in the eye or brain.

Quality cannot be denied to exist, and yet it seems to be strangely extruded from the naturalistic picture as a subjective superfluity which nature could very well get along without.*

46. Does naturalism explain the mind?

If the brain has no quality, the brain is certainly not the mind. A motion in the brain may accompany the thinking process, but it is evident on consideration that a motion is one thing and a thought is something quite different. It is important to be clear on this point, for in common speech we often interchange the 'brain' and the 'mind.'

If materialism says, as Hobbes held, that a sensation is nothing but a form of motion, and a thought is nothing but a chain of dying sensations, hence a sequence of motions, the only possible answer is that the proposition is nonsense. When two objects are identical, you can substitute one for the other in every statement. But try to substitute for the mental proposition, "I hate you," the physical proposition, "There is in my nervous system and viscera a physico-chemical disturbance of a certain pattern. . . ." The microscopic inspection of a brain process, however perfect, would simply fail to discover any suggestion of what we mean by thought or feeling. We must hold to the clear insight of Des-

* This appalling and incredible loss of all quality from the conception of nature, which Fechner called the "night-view" of the world, neo-realism tries to correct within the bounds of naturalism. See chapter xxix.

cartes on this point: the essence of the mind is thinking, and thinking is not an event in space.

The only ground for materialism that is even worth considering is that the mind, though different from the body, is a *product* of the body, or an *inseparable accompaniment* of the body. If we say, with the French physician, Cabanis (1757–1808), that "the brain secretes thought as the liver secretes bile," we are obliged to take the word "secrete" in a Pickwickian sense: it is a secretion which has no chemical character. But it may be that when the brain acts in a certain way, *thought takes place*, as an effect in its own world.

This is Büchner's position,—not that the brain and its operations *are* the mind, but that they are the producers of the mind: "that the brain is the *organ* of thought, and that these two, brain and thought, stand in such an immediate and necessary connection that neither can exist without the other" (Chapter on Brain and Soul).

But this position evidently raises the question, How is it that, while everywhere else in nature motion produces motion and nothing else, here in the brain motion produces sensation and thought?

Does naturalism really explain the mind, or does its explanation run a circuit which completes itself by cutting the mind out, just as it excluded the qualities which the mind perceives?

47. To make clear this contrast between the

mind and the brain (or any other physical object), let us note certain specific points of difference.

a. The mind observes itself; the brain does not. This was the point of Pascal's observation of the greatness and littleness of the human being. As compared with the mountain, the man is minute; the mountain may crush him. But the man (in so far as he is a mind) has this point of superiority, that he knows he is being crushed, whereas the mountain does not know of its own superiority. As knower of the infinity of the universe of nature, man is the greater thing.

b. The brain is in space; the mind is not. If this is not at once obvious, experiment with a few questions which imply that the mind is in space, such as these:

Where is it? Is it in the head? Is it out in front? What are its size and its shape? Is it harder to think of a long distance than of a short distance? Is it a longer thought? Is the thought of a cube a cubic thought? Are the several thoughts in the same mind at any one time above or below one another? Can they become crowded? Can the capacity of the mind become exhausted, so that no more ideas can be inserted? Does a great thought require more head-room than a petty one? No doubt the thought of an object is in some fashion *with* the object, and while, as an activity of thinking, it is quite different from

H65

the object, as comprehending or being with the object it is affected by the qualities of the object. Hence the thought of the universe, or of all of space, while not a spacious thought, does imply by the instantaneous flash of understanding which grasps what is intended a certain infinitude in the reach of the mind. But in whatever sense the mind is related to space when space is thought of, it includes the whole of space in its view, and is therefore not 'in' space. In this sense, also, it is obviously far from being identical with the brain, which is one of the objects in space which we can think *about*, not think *with*.

c. The brain is in the present only: the mind is extended in time to the past and the future.

When you try to explain memory by traces in the brain left by past experiences, you must consider that those traces are present traces. When they are aroused, you have an image of the past event. How does it differ from present impressions? It is fainter. Yes: but faintness is not pastness. For the brain, the past is gone. Nothing can locate an image in the past except a mind which holds the past before it. And so with the future.

d. The brain is a set of facts: the mind is a set of facts and their *meanings*.

A fact has a *meaning* when it stands for something else, as a vertical cross for addition. A fact *means* whatever it points to or leads to beyond itself. A news-stand means a chance for a paper;

LIBRARY
UNITED THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
of the
Twin Cities

a red sunset means a fine day to follow (?); a certain whistle means to the pilot passing to starboard; a certain track means to the hunter the recent neighborhood of his game. To Sherlock Holmes, every minute fact means something; intelligence might be measured by the amount of meaning facts have for the mind.

In the brain there are facts, but no meanings. What is a meaning for the mind is a *connection* for the brain: the five-o'clock whistle is connected (or 'associated') with the muscular activities of quitting work. But a connection is not a meaning. The physical fact, to itself, is meaningless. To the mind, nothing is meaningless.

e. Among these meanings are the *qualities* we were speaking of (§13), and in particular *pleasure and pain.*

We avoid the fire because fire *means* the pain of getting burned; we seek the mountains or the sea in summer because they *mean* certain types of pleasure. The brain *per se* can not enjoy nor suffer. The mind cannot escape joy and suffering: no experience is completely neutral. The mind is occupied with *values.* The brain is a system of facts.

In particular, the mind is occupied with *moral values,* judgments of right and wrong. It is there, perhaps, that we feel the difference between brain and mind most sharply. On its physical side what we call a crime may be a very simple operation,

such as pulling a trigger. And if pulling that trigger is a mechanically necessary result of heredity and environment, the word crime and the meaning of moral reproach it carries are out of place. If we could regard the world simply as a fact, we should not so much as prefer virtue and its results to vice and its results. The Universal Robots could lose a hand or a limb without pain: they could be junked without crime. Or if we could retain our preferences for some results rather than others, we might still regard the criminal as a disordered machine, and call the doctor rather than the judge.

Thus, a recent book on criminology has to say that "most crimes come about through disturbances of the ductless glands in the criminal or through mental defects caused by endocrine troubles in the criminal's mother."* Like the rest of us, on this theory, the criminal is devoid of free will; but he suffers from a "criminal imperative" which should relieve him from the moral reprobation we continue to feel toward each other, naturalists apparently sharing this feeling with the rest of mankind. In the case of the criminal, glandular medication should replace moral criticism and punishment.

But—not doubting that the mentally diseased criminal must have medical care—it is impossible for the sound human being to be morally neu-

* The New Criminology, M. G. Schlapp and E. H. Smith.

tral, just as it is impossible for him to ignore his sense of pleasure and pain. The brain is indifferent to right and wrong. To the mind, this is the most important of distinctions.

These differences between the mind and that physical object we call the brain and nervous system, or the entire organism and its behavior, suggest at every point that the mind is something not only different from the body, but *more than* the body. They emphasize the query whether naturalism can explain the mind as a product of nature, the greater by the less.*

48. Does naturalism explain truth?

According to naturalism, a thought is an effect of some preceding cause. Change the cause and you change the thought. A man's philosophy would then be the result of the causes that act upon him, including his own inherited temperament. Hindu mysticism might be due to the enervating effect of a hot climate; Schopenhauer's pessimism to a disordered liver.

But in this case, of what temperamental bias or atmospheric influence is naturalism the effect? What change of diet will turn the naturalist into a mystic? If philosophy is the result of such causes, what is to guarantee its truth? If natural-

* For a development of this discussion of the peculiarities of the mind which make it irreducible to a function of the body, see my book, The Self, Its Body and Freedom, 28–49.

ism explains our thoughts in this cause-and-effect manner, does it not undermine its own case?

In a review of Robinson's Mind in the Making, Mr. H. G. Wells has this to say:

> "I do not know who it was who first said that the human mind being a product of the struggle for existence was essentially a food-seeking system, and no more essentially a truth-finding apparatus than the snout of a pig. I believe it must have been Arthur Balfour, twenty-five or thirty years ago. (Slander!)
>
> "It is upon the lines of this suggestion, it is upon a profound scepticism of the truth-testing instrument, that the new school of thought is going. Our minds, the most fundamental of our presuppositions, are as much a response to immediate necessities and as much the outcome of a process of trial, error, and adaptation as our bodies; they are as little to be relied on in new situations as our animal instincts. . . ."

Mr. Wells's inference from the naturalistic theory of mentality is quite legitimate. But this consequence is at variance with what we mean by truth. Truth does not vary with the climate; nor does our apprehension of it vary (consistently) with these variable causes. The multiplication table, the principles of logic, work in the same way for us at the equator and at the poles; what is true in physics and chemistry holds true for us whatever our state of health or temperament. Naturalism fails to account for the mind as a

knower of truth. Reason is not a part of the chain of causes and effects.

Naturalistic psychology can give causal explanation of our errors: it is at home there. It cannot explain our reasonable deeds and thoughts.

"Let a reasonable being make a mistake in his thinking, and his mistake immediately becomes a phenomenon for psychology. If I add two and two and get four, the result has nothing to do with the climate, the state of my nerves, or my personal idiosyncracies. It is no function of any *event* in heaven or earth. But if I should get five, an enquiry into these conditions would at once become relevant. There is no reason for going wrong; there is no cause for going right. Hence psychology is peculiarly interested in errors and illusions. It might almost be called the science of human fallibility."*

If we were completely causal beings, why should we feel it so much a matter of pride to be treated as rational? And why should we experience such deep resentment at being 'managed'? Psychology, we were saying, can be applied to every situation in which human beings can be *managed:* but in what situations can this take place?

It is applied, for example, to advertising. But let me discover that the advertiser on the advice of the psychologist has artfully designed his picture of the family group assembled around the evening table for the sake of playing on my do-

* Hocking, Man and the State, 202.

mestic instincts and inducing me to buy his lampshades, and my heart is at once hardened. When I find out that I am being managed, the causal series fails to work. Let me learn the trick of the dramatic play on my emotions, and I cease to be moved. But what kind of a science is that which ceases to be true when its laws are found out! It certainly does not work to treat the human being as if he were a thing of cause and effect, unless you can keep it from him as a dark secret that you are doing so. There must then be something false in the assumptions of the causal psychology. The human being is something more than a creature of cause and effect.

49. There are some features of the world which naturalism does not profess to explain: it regards them as inexplicable,—we must simply take them as given matters of fact.

If you explain an event by a law, that leaves the law unexplained. I see a steel rail buckled in the sun; and this is explained to me by the law that heat expands metals. But why does heat expand metals? This is explained by reference to a more general law of the collision of particles in motion. This law may in turn be explained by a wider law: but the last law in the series, while it explains all the others, is left unexplained.

Further, naturalism accepts the ingredients of the world, their quantity and proportion, and

their arrangement, as given facts. They are here, and that is the end of it. We explain their rearrangements; we do not attempt to explain their presence.

If we suggest that leaving these things unexplained casts a shadow on the completeness of the naturalistic philosophy, we are told that no one can do any better. In every philosophy, what exists must be taken as given. Our knowledge cannot penetrate into the secrets of absolute creation.

But before we accept this closing of the door to understanding, we have a further question to put. In the naturalistic view, "efficient causes" have driven out "final causes," that is, to explain a thing by causal law excludes its explanation by purpose. Is this true? Can the two types of explanation exist together? This deserves a separate enquiry.

Chapter VII

THE NEWER TELEOLOGY

50. *Causality and Purpose.* In ordinary language, we speak of the cause of an event as some other event (or group of events) which immediately preceded the given event and, as we suppose, required it to be. Causes precede and, as it were, push their effects into being. The blows of a maul upon a wedge drive the wedge into the wood, and heat the wedge. There is no question in our minds which is cause and which the effects. Causality we might roughly describe as the determining of events from behind in time. Purpose on the contrary is the determining of events from ahead in time. One who has a purpose sees ahead to a future state of things which he wishes to bring about, and works toward it. It is this picture of future and as yet non-existent things which animates his present action. It would not be wholly astray if we should say that causality works from the past into the present, and purpose from the future into the present; though evidently the event which is purposed as well as the event which is caused is moving in the direction of all temporal events from the present toward the future. All physical events, we believe, lie in some causal series. All mental events, we believe, lie in some purposive sequence; for there is no mind, so

far as we know, which is devoid of preference or choice and the disposition to act for what it chooses. Now our question is, Are these two types of process mutually exclusive? If we have a world in which everything is in causal order, must we dismiss the notion that there is purpose in it?

In the case of a machine, no one doubts that it operates by mechanical causes. It is not the driver of an automobile who makes the car go. On the other hand, the assembling of the machine in the first place, and its guidance seem determined by the end in view, the purpose, Aristotle's 'final cause.' But the driver himself is in part a mechanism; and naturalism says altogether so. In any case his purpose is a fact which cannot be abolished. He pictures himself, at a future moment, in some particular place; and that object, which seems to him to govern his actions, coexists with the mechanism of his body. It may be a good maxim for the scientific mind not to *fall back* on final causes when it is studying nature: but it is clearly a mistake to suppose that all purpose must be excluded. For there it is—a fact of experience. And it has found some way of living together with the causes.

51. Let us examine more carefully the working of causes and purposes.

Causal action cannot be observed. We observe only the sequence of events. The sun rises and the

air becomes warm; we note the sequence, but we do not observe the sun's rays causing the warmth. The axe falls and the wood falls apart: we do not see the force of the wedge splitting the wood. The moving picture, or the stage blow, gives us an equally convincing spectacle of causality though there is no force at work in either case. Causation cannot be perceived. This is Hume's proposition. (Rand, 313–326.)

Why, then, are we so sure about causal laws? We *believe* that all events have a cause; and this belief leads us to try to fit events together. There must be some cause, we believe, for the gradual warming of the day; and as the sun is changing its position somewhat in proportion to the change of heat, we easily make the connection.

But what is the source of that belief that every event must have a cause?

Hume thought it a result of mental habit. When we observe often and without exception that event B follows event A, we expect every A to be followed by a B. Repeated confirmation of such expectations in a great variety of instances of sequence induces the generalized belief that for every event a cause can be found. The real force of the belief in causality lies in the strength of our expectation. If Hume is right, it is only probable, not certain, that every event has a cause. There is no way to prove it.

Without attempting to pass judgment on

Hume's argument, we must give him credit for having called attention (of Kant among others) to the great difficulty of vindicating even what used to be called the 'causal axiom,'—that every event must have a cause, and a sufficient cause. Causality is *imputed to* the world-order, rather than seen in it.

Now the perception of purposes is in very much the same case. We do not see purposes: we impute them. Here is a train at the station, and here a man running toward it and boarding it. We seem to have seen the man running *for the train;* but we have seen only the sequence of events,—the purpose is inserted by our conjecture.

We read purposes (or motives) into human conduct at a well-known risk: the 'imputing of motives' is notoriously liable to error. The risk is greater when we impute motives to animals. If we venture beyond the animal realm into the world at large, we take still greater risks.

Yet, as we can neither prove that every event has a cause nor disprove it, so we can neither prove nor disprove that *every event has a purpose.* The failure to find a cause does not disprove its existence: no more does the failure to find a purpose disprove its existence.

It is logically possible that every event has *both a cause and a purpose* or meaning.

52. And it is also logically possible that those

features of the world which causality leaves unexplained, such as the highest natural law, the amount, proportion, distribution of the matter and motion of the world, have a meaning and thus a possible purpose.

Purpose may be appealed to to explain *quantities*. Thus, the bow of William the Conqueror: Why is it just so large? There is no mechanical answer, but purpose explains it at once. It must be stout enough to defy all other arms: it must be not so stout as to defy his own. The quantities of the world may have a meaning.

53. Note that we are only talking about logical possibilities. All we say, so far, is that even if we could explain every event by its causes, there would still be room for explaining the same events by their purposes. But we should not be justified in asserting such purposes unless we had some positive ground for doing so.

When have we such ground? Evidently, in the first place, the result must have *some assignable value*. The waves wash the sand up and wash it out again; our ideas of purpose find here nothing to light on. The production of an oak-tree or of the vertebrate animals or of man or of a sunset, however, seems to have some worth, and our thoughts pause to enquire whether that value could have been intended. But, in the second place, there must be some evidence that the process

tends to preserve what it has produced. And there is no evidence that anything tends to retain the sunset. Organic bodies are in a different case: they are produced, and preserved by the processes of nature. But even yet, we would hardly have enough ground to assert purpose unless we could see that *the means* by which the result was brought about were somehow *selected* from many other possible sets of causes, and not merely random combinations of events.

Is there any evidence of this sort that nature, or any of the features of nature, may be regarded as results of purpose, at the same time that they are results of causality?

54. Now the several steps of "emergent evolution"—taking the step from inorganic to organic forms, then from the non-mental to the mental, then from the sub-rational to the rational as the chief of such events—seem to our judgment to have brought forth something of value, and also to have preserved what has been brought forth, at least to the present time. But is there any evidence of the selection of means?

The naturalistic believer in emergence relies on causality alone; and in doing so he makes use of an *unavowed assumption*, namely, that changes of form being implied in the constant motion of the ingredients of the world, *given sufficient time all possible forms must be arrived at, all possible arrangements of the ultimate units of the world*, so

that eventually organisms were bound to happen. Let us examine this very common and plausible assumption.

Create an imaginary universe. Let it consist of four particles set at the four corners of an exact square; and endowed with gravitative attraction for each other, and with perfect elasticity. The history of this universe can be precisely foretold through all eternity. The four particles will first move toward each other along the diagonals of the square. They will click together at the same instant, and being elastic will return to the exact point of departure (supposing we gave them no initial velocity); they will then repeat the cycle and continue without variation forever.

Now create another universe like the former, with a single difference. Let one particle be slightly off the corner of the square. Can you now predict the history? They will move toward one another as before; but they will not click at the same instant. The rebound will be irregular, and none of them will arrive precisely at the point of departure. The subsequent journeys will show an increase of irregularity for a time depending on the degree of the original malformation. But one thing we may say with entire certainty: at no time will the four particles of this second universe form a perfect square.

And since the particles of our first universe are never in any other relation than that of a perfect

square, we may say with equal certainty that throughout eternity the particles of the two universes never fall into the same figure. In general, an original symmetry will always give symmetrical configurations; and an original asymmetry will always beget asymmetry.

It is evidently false then to assume that any given universe must run through all the possible configurations of its particles if we give it time enough. And if this is true of the picayune universes we have been experimenting with; how much more is it the case of the actual universe, that its entire history is a unique series of configurations, from which an infinitude of possible configurations of those same particles are forever excluded as unrealized. The common belief that in infinite time the stuff of the world must arrange itself in every possible way, therefore in this present way, is one of the few errors of which we may conservatively say that it is infinitely wide of the mark!

We may then assert that the assumption on which the naturalistic emergentist relies is unfounded: *form has no inherent tendency to rise.* If it does rise, it is as if the series of shapes which constitute the causal history of the universe were selected from an infinite number of possible other shapes. And the grounds required for applying the idea of purpose are present. Emergent evolution is as if it were the result of intention.

55. This is a generalized form of what Professor Henderson undertakes to show in a highly concrete manner in his book, The Fitness of the Environment. The result in which he is interested is the production of organisms. They are results worth producing. But it is easy to imagine universes with slightly different proportions of these same materials—let us say a little more nitrogen and a little less carbon or oxygen—which would have rendered not only such organisms as we know but any organisms at all impossible.* Of all the possible universes (with ingredients like these) the present one is nearly the fittest for the production of organisms. It is thus reasonable to call it *biocentric*. There is thus a principle of teleology in the structure of the universe—or a possible principle of this sort—which the criticism of the teleological argument cannot exclude.

Professor Henderson avoids the word purpose; he leaves the nature of the end-reaching tendency for metaphysics to decide. He does not allow that this tendency ever interferes with the perfect mechanism of nature. It does all its work "at the very origin of things, just before mechanism begins to act" (p. 308). Whether in the course of evolution life arose from dead matter, Henderson

* At this point, note a logical weakness in Henderson's argument which the argument of §54 avoids. The change in the proportions of ingredients would render organisms impossible only if the *laws* of physics and biology remain constant. But why, if we are altering the universe, not consider the laws as altered also? And so altered that organisms could flourish?

does not try to decide; but if it did, "that is surely the crowning and most wonderful instance of teleology in the whole universe."

To take the argument at its minimum showing, it is possible that there is in the world something more than nature,—namely, a purpose which the configuration of this nature of ours obeys. With this possibility the force of naturalism is broken. This possibility of itself gives us no more positive result. We seek therefore another type of philosophy which may provide grounds for decision.

READING FOR AN ESSAY ON NATURALISM

Haeckel, Ernst. Riddle of the Universe. Chapters 1, 6, 10, 11, 12, 15. Or

Spencer, Herbert. First Principles, Part II (Rand 703–732). Sketching the argument, with especial attention to chapters i, iv–vi, viii, x, xii, xiv–xvii, xix, xxii–xxiv.

And in addition one of the following:

On the ethical aspect of Naturalism

Spencer, Data of Ethics, chs. i–iv, xi, xii, xiv.

Huxley, T. H. Lay Sermons, xiv (On Descartes); Evolution and Ethics; Life and Letters, I, 241–244.

Nietzsche, Beyond Good and Evil, sections on The Religious Mood, Natural History of Morals, Our Virtues.

On the religious aspect of Naturalism

Romanes, G. J. Examination of Theism. 1878.

Mill, J. S. Auguste Comte and Positivism, Part ii.

Spencer, H. First Principles, Part I.

Russell, B. A Free Man's Worship.

Huxley, Julian. Religion Without Revelation.

Poetical expressions of Naturalism

Lucretius. De rerum natura. (Bakewell, 305–316.)

Santayana. Three Philosophical Poets, Lucretius.

Fitzgerald. Rubaiyat of Omar Khayyam.

PART II

THEORIES OF KNOWLEDGE

Chapter VIII

DISTRUST OF REASON—SCEPTICISM

56. Having considered one type of world-view, naturalism, against the background of another, primitive spiritualism, we have gained some experience of the difficulty of reaching *certainty* in metaphysics.

Naturalism, as a rule, has been an expression of great confidence in human reason. Its case has often been presented as a case of reason against faith. Yet anything like a strict proof of its case has not been forthcoming: it is extraordinarily difficult to prove that something—whether black swans or supernature—does *not* exist. And naturalism has led by its own logic, strangely enough, to a doubt about the capacity of reason in metaphysics: if reasoning is *caused*, it has no guarantee of working true.

We are therefore ready for a review of the question, What we human beings are fitted to know, and Whether there are limits definite or indefinite to the successful use of reason. The history of philosophy includes in its records many outspoken critics of the philosophic enterprise (for a clear-headed critic of philosophy must be a philosopher).* There are the sceptics, who

* As Pascal put it, "Se moquer de la philosophie, c'est vraiment philosopher." Pensées, XXV, 57.

doubt the validity of reason everywhere, the agnostics who doubt its validity in the special field of metaphysics, and a series of "anti-intellectualists" who claim that we can indeed reach metaphysical truth, but by some organ other than the intellect or logical reason. Such anti-intellectualists are the pragmatists and the intuitionists. We shall consider in turn each of these "ways of knowing," giving especial attention to the two last named. We must begin with a glance at our natural confidence in reason.

57. *Naïve Rationalism.* Men naturally trust their reasoning power. Or rather, they do not naturally distrust it. We reason, as we breathe, without being aware that we are doing it, and hence without calling into question our power to do it successfully. Our attention is given not to the act of thinking, but to the object thought about: it hardly occurs to us that we are using a special tool or instrument which may fail or mislead us. It is a part of our animal self-confidence that we can think successfully, and so get a true philosophy. In this sense, we are born rationalists.

No doubt, ever since man became a reasoning being, that is, ever since he became human, he has been aware that knowledge of the hidden and remote powers is difficult,—the world has its 'secrets': furthermore, some men appear better qualified for solving the deeper riddles than oth-

ers. Hence the primitive philosophy, in religious form, was handed down from the skilled knowers to the unskilled masses authoritatively; philosophy was a privileged knowledge, a "revelation" which could be taken as true, and ought to be so taken, without the critical checking-up of individual judgment. Thus the majority got their philosophy, if not entirely without thinking, yet without other thinking than that required to understand more or less vaguely what they were told. This way of getting a philosophy had one advantage; it enabled whole tribes, perhaps nations, to believe together, and so to act on a common faith.

But vigorous brain-power can never have been a complete monopoly of the official priesthood. Although we cannot say that in mentality all men are created equal, still, as Hobbes shrewdly remarks, there is one sign of approximate equality, that "each is content with his share!" Any lively society, with a spark of science in it, will beget its independent thinkers who will work out a world-view for themselves which may or may not coincide with the traditional view. When this happens, the day of undisputed authority, and also of philosophic agreement, is past. In addition to the generally received creed, we have here and there "a philosophy," i. e., some notable thinker's special creation, identified with his name, and bringing together as many minds as he can persuade to think like himself.

We are not to think of these early philosophies as made by lone thinkers of great personal daring, in hostility to prevailing religious ideas. Very likely many of them arose in groups of alert-minded friends, who worked out their views together, in conversation; their aim being not so much to dissent from tradition as to get a literal grasp of its vaguely poetic or symbolic language. The early philosophers of Greece were prominent members of groups or 'schools' of active heads, much occupied with the scientific and political interests of their day. One of the most interesting of them, Pythagoras (sixth century B. C.), was at once a mathematician, a philosopher, and founder of a fraternity aiming at the moral reformation of society. It is no accident that the same age which brought forth the first democracies, showing in politics its confidence in the general ability of the human crowd to *think*, also brought forth the first secular *philosophies* of the western world.

Naturalism is one of the early results of this independent thinking: and throughout the history of human thought it has usually been, as the most thoroughly anti-theological type of philosophy, the product of an unusually sturdy confidence in human reason. The word "rationalist" was once equivalent, in English usage, to the "free-thinker" who had renounced his faith in the supernatural. Thomas Paine's "Age of Reason" is an American

echo of the spirit of the French "Enlightment" which, in giving birth to the Revolution, found it fitting to crown Reason as its goddess. Probably no subsequent age has been so confident of the sufficiency of reason to solve the riddles of the universe.

If, then, naturalism leads, as we saw, to the logical consequence that reason is a defective instrument for getting philosophic truth, this result is somewhat of a blow to the temper in which naturalism itself was begotten. Nevertheless, there are many considerations independent of naturalism which conspire to this same conclusion—distrust of the power of reason; some of them have led thoughtful men to scepticism ever since serious philosophic effort began.

58. *Misology: Sophistry.* One of these considerations is the simple fact of *philosophical disagreement.* If the results of independent reasoning are out of accord with tradition, they are also very quickly out of accord with each other, and we have a succession of differing "schools" of philosophy. Each philosopher, with a sense of final discovery, adds a new opinion to the now long list of world-views; and the history of philosophy may well appear as a gallery of ambitious failures. These individual philosophies do not appear to fuse into a growing body of established truth, as do the results of science; and the suspicion lies

near that the philosophic undertaking is somehow less natural than the scientific,—may be beyond the natural scope of human reason.

The more anemic and easily discouraged minds have been inclined, from ancient days, to counsel retreat; to fall back upon the authority of divine revelation, which, they say, is alone capable of giving unity and peace;* or else, to give up the effort of possessing beliefs and take one's mental and moral ease in superficial living. They become the "misologists" or malcontents of reason described by Socrates in the Phædo. Socrates speaks as one who has gone through this trouble himself, and simply admonishes his friends not to indulge in a peevish blaming of 'reason,' when the proper object of blame is the *reasoner*, i. e., our own stupidity. Socrates probably had in mind the Sophists of his time, the professional teachers of the art of rhetoric and debate, some of whom, assuming that truth is out of reach, counselled their students, as the best equipment for success in public life, to be ready to take *any side* of an argument. This breed is not yet entirely extinct.

59. *Scepticism.* Others, of a greater mental vigor, seeing reason caught in difficulties, try to find a reason for those difficulties, thus bringing

* For a modern, developed, and highly responsible form of this conclusion, see Pascal (Pensées, 1670), Lamennais (Essai sur l'indifference en matière de religion, 1878), and Cardinal Newman (Grammar of Assent, 1870). See also Al Ghazzali, Moslem mystic, "The Collapse of the Philosophers."

reason to the diagnosis of its own disease. They may reach something like a reasoned proof that reason is incompetent, as one may prove in mechanics that perpetual motion is impossible, or in mathematics that the circle cannot be squared. They then become, in the technical sense, "sceptics," like the Greek Gorgias and Pyrrho of Elis, or like David Hume.*

The Greek sceptics had before them a peculiarly interesting case of the opposition of philosophical results. Their predecessors had agreed that the senses are deceitful, and that reason is given us to correct their false reports. But as to what our senses tell us, and our reason, they gave opposite opinions. One school, the Eleatics, had contended that the senses show us things as perpetually changing and passing away, whereas reason discovers that reality is permanent and unchanging. Another school, that of Heracleitus, had taught that the senses show us things as stable, whereas reason, looking deeper, discerns that "all things flow." Under these circumstances, argued the sceptics, how can we trust either sense or reason? The trouble seemed to be that our ideas fit the facts of experience so loosely that opposite judgments may be made with equal justification. Zeno, of Elea, had made himself notorious

* See the Platonic Dialogue, Gorgias (Bakewell, p. 67), Diogenes Laertius, Lives, ix, 61, David Hume, Inquiry concerning Human Understanding, sec. xii (Rand, 342), Treatise on Human Nature, Bk. I, ch. iv.

by propounding his paradoxes (Achilles and the Tortoise, the Moving Arrow, etc.*) in order to show that our ideas of number, rest and motion could not be strictly applied without entangling us in contradictions. Gorgias and Pyrrho carried this same logic out into all the work of reason, and concluded that it is not the part of wisdom to hold any conviction firmly, but rather to maintain an easy reserve toward every belief, and keep the mind serenely free—from fanaticism, of course, but also from those commitments which attend all clear decision in belief.

This counsel, if one could carry it out, would lead to an ideal poise, indifference, and practical uselessness such as no living man has ever attained. But if one could be sceptical enough to be moderate also about his scepticism (as Pyrrho proposed) this attitude might lend an easy urbanity to the manners, and a supple opportunism to the character, which would allow a man to float genially with a noble superiority to all earnest purpose in a society whose hard work was done by others. The most attractive examples of this type are to be found in men of the world who, having

* (1) If the tortoise is ahead of Achilles, Achilles can never catch it. For when Achilles reaches the place where the tortoise was, the tortoise is at some distance farther on; when Achilles reaches this farther point, the tortoise has gone still farther. And so on, ad infinitum. (2) The arrow must move either where it is or where it is not. But it cannot move where it is not. Nor yet can it move where it is; for to be where it is is not to move. Hence it cannot move at all. There are eight of these paradoxes, some of which appear to us as verbal subtleties; nevertheless, easier to dismiss than to analyze. A good summary of them in Enc. Brit., 13th ed., art. Zeno of Elea.

reached that philosophy which consists in a contempt of philosophy, a graceful and sophisticated aloofness of mind, cherish the sentiment of Montaigne, "How kindly and healthful a cushion are ignorance and incuriousness for a well-conducted head."

60. In so far as scepticism results from unusually keen mental criticism, it is of the utmost use in philosophy. Our mental workshop must be able to stand the severest inspection, especially inspection by reason itself. The sceptic may be the most idle of thinkers; but he may also be the most earnest,—being sceptical because he desires to entrust his life to nothing short of a completely certain foundation.

Thus the good faith of philosophy is shown in its welcoming the sincere sceptic, including him among the philosophers, and attempting by his aid to reach a just estimate of the powers of reason. The development of philosophy is largely due to this scrupulous consideration of every legitimate doubt. Socrates himself was not less cautious than the keenest Sophist; he was aware of his own ignorance; he was puzzled by the saying of the Delphic oracle that "No man in Athens was wiser than he"; his solution of this puzzle was his discovery (the Socratic "irony") that to know that one knows nothing is a highly important kind of knowledge. For this knowledge separates one by a wide gulf from the self-confident igno-

ramus who is unaware of his own deficiency; and, further, it starts one on the right road to gain genuine knowledge.* At the threshold of the modern era, Nicolas of Cusa in the same spirit wrote a treatise "De docta ignorantia," "On the instructed ignorance" (1440).† And Descartes (1596–1650), deliberately adopted the method of trying to push doubt to its extremest point, in order to find at least one proposition which could not be doubted. In his Meditations, he imagines himself supposing

"that all the things I see are fictitious; that none of the objects my memory represents ever existed; that I have no real sense of an outer world: that body with its shape, extension, motion or position, is but a fiction of my mind. What, then, can be held to as true? Perhaps only this, that there is nothing certainly true. . . . But if, with the other bodies, I thus doubt the existence of my own body, does not this carry with it a suspicion that I myself do not exist? Hardy so, since it is I who do the suspecting! But may there not be some malignant Being of supreme power and cunning who is carrying an ingenious deception into the very centre of my life? Even then, if I am deceived, I must exist. No deception can bring it about that I am nothing, so long as I am aware of myself as a conscious being. Then this proposition, I am, is necessarily true, every time I frame it."‡

* Read Socrates' defense of his way of life in Plato's Apology (Bakewell, Source Book, 104 f.; Everyman's Library, Socratic Discourses, p. 325).

† See Falckenberg, History of Modern Philosophy, Ch. 1.

‡ The whole of this memorable passage should be read by every student of philosophy, namely, Meditation, ii, in "Meditations on First Philosophy." Rand, 122; R. M. Eaton, Descartes, 95; Rogers, Student's History, 278.

The best doubter cannot doubt that he is doubting, and in doubting, he is thinking, acting, therefore necessarily *existing: cogito ergo sum.*

The effort to doubt everything thus leads to the discovery that there is something which cannot be doubted: a perfectly universal scepticism is impossible. The criticism of reason must recognize a sphere in which reason is successful, and mark it off from other spheres in which it works badly, or perhaps necessarily fails.

61. *Scientific Rationalism.* It would be hard for a thinker like Descartes, living in the flush of the early triumphs of modern science, to restrict his sense of certain knowledge to the simple proposition, I exist. Reason appeared to be successful also in mathematics and in the applied mathematics of mechanical science. Further, the ancient scepticism about the reports of the senses seemed to drop away. After all, the senses do not literally "deceive" us, for they *make no assertions;* if we make false inferences from what we see and hear, as when we take a shimmer of sand for a lake, that is our fault, not the fault of the senses. Sensations are the raw material of experience; and it is as impossible to doubt that this raw material, —this color or touch or noise or taste,—is *present* as to doubt that we exist. The business of reason is to make these materials into a consistent story, finding the rules whereby one sensation leads to

another, correcting false inferences by better ones. If my eye suggests to me the false judgment that the oar in the water is bent, i. e., will work like a crooked or broken oar, I can learn to correct that illusion, and even to explain it, by ascertaining the laws of refraction.

Thus the modern world seemed to enter into a period of rational security about a part of knowledge, at least; and was ready to raise the question whether the same methods which succeed so well in mathematics and science cannot be transferred to the field of philosophy. Descartes, Spinoza, and Leibniz, together with the Englishman Hobbes, the typical rationalists of modern times, were inspired by the *mathematical* side of modern science and tried to attain the same kind of certainty in metaphysics. John Locke was inspired rather by the certainties found in *sense-experience* as used in science, and built up an equally rational "empiricism" which he thought would likewise lead to metaphysical certainty. From this new burst of confidence in reason sprang the most imposing and architecturally perfect philosophical systems of modern times.

62. *Agnosticism.* It cannot be said that these great systems have failed. It can be said that they left a growing doubt in reflective minds about the cogency of the scientific method in metaphysics. They led to a restricted form of scepticism which

we have recently come to call agnosticism, the view that while reason is at home within "experience," it can do nothing beyond experience: the successes of science can *not* be carried over into metaphysics.

It is the business of science to show us the true relations of one experience to another; anything more than this 'relative' knowledge is unattainable and unnecessary. For instance, we cannot know whether the earth is moving absolutely through space nor how fast: but if we know its rest or movement relative to the sun and to other heavenly bodies, that is sufficient. It is not quite certain that "absolute motion" has any sense. Let knowledge, then, refrain from trying to discover absolute causes, beginnings, or endings, or the ultimate nature of things. There may be an absolute reality: but we can know nothing about it either now or at any future time. Such is the position of Herbert Spencer and of T. H. Huxley (who coined the word 'agnostic'); it was also the position of the French positivist, Auguste Comte (1798–1857, Cours de philosophie positive, 1830–1842), and of Immanuel Kant (1724–1804, Critique of Pure Reason, 1781) before them.

We have already noticed Kant's view of the failure of reason to reach a proof of the existence of God. There can be, he thought, no metaphysics of strictly scientific character, no theoretical knowledge of what things are in themselves, not even of

what we human beings are in ourselves. An empirical psychology is possible, but not a 'rational' psychology, that is to say a psychology which begins with certain axiomatic statements about the soul (as that it is absolutely simple and indivisible) and therefrom infers its immortality (since, as Plato had already argued, the simple cannot be decomposed nor destroyed).

These negative results of Kant's great Critique of Reason are consequences which he draws from his positive principles of knowledge. These positive principles allowed that we may have complete certainty in mathematics and in certain formal aspects of physics; so that the sciences of nature rest upon a secure foundation. The propositions of geometry, for example, are "universal and necessary": there is not and cannot be any part of space to which they do not apply (Kant was thinking of Euclidean geometry and of Newtonian space). Likewise with the general scientific principle that "Every event must have a cause,"—a principle whose certainty Hume, as we have seen (§51), called into question. If propositions of this sort are derived from experience, as the British empirical philosophers (Locke, Berkeley and Hume) had been thinking, they are certainly not axiomatic (as Descartes had thought); and it is hard to see how they can be anything more than probable generalizations, or biological habits, subject to change. For "experience" can never reach far enough to tell us what is true everywhere and at all times. The progress of empiricism was shaking the foundations of the sciences, and Berkeley was audacious enough to try a tilt against the infinitesimal calculus! Kant, himself a scientist and a believer in science, saw that this peril could not be met by an appeal to axiomatic or self-evident truth, after the fashion of the traditional continental rationalism. His originality lay in making a distinc-

tion, namely, between the knowledge which comes *from* experience, and the knowledge which *constitutes* experience, or, as he put it, "makes experience possible."

Our ideas of trees, rivers, men are plainly gotten from experience. Of space, time, causality, the same cannot be said: the eye presents us things in space, but not space itself. Though space itself cannot be seen, yet it must *be there* in order that anything may be seen. Similarly of causality: it cannot be observed, but it must *be there* in order that any event in nature may be understood, and set into intelligible relation with other events. So Kant says of such ideas three things: they are (1) not given by experience; they (2) make experience possible (being the *forms* wherein the stuff of experience is ordered in being received); they are (3) the products of the mind's own activity.

This last named proposition, which gives experience a subjective factor, will concern us later on (§154). It is itself a metaphysical speculation, and separable from the rest of Kant's work. What concerns us now is this: that if (1) and (2) are true, we should infer as Kant did that the spatial form, and the geometry that goes with it, as well as the causal form, would be valid everywhere in experience; because they would furnish its constitutional law, so to speak. At the same time, any attempt to use them beyond experience would be illegitimate, and could lead only to self-deception.

Huxley writes thus of his own view of knowledge:

"When I reached intellectual maturity and began to ask myself whether I was an atheist, a theist or a pantheist, a materialist or an idealist, a Christian or a freethinker, I found that the more I learned

and reflected, the less ready was the answer. The one thing on which most of these good people were agreed was the one thing wherein I differed from them. They were quite sure they had attained a certain 'gnosis'—had more or less successfully solved the problem of existence: while I was sure I had not, and had a pretty strong opinion that the problem was insoluble. This was my situation when I had the good fortune to find a place among the members of the Metaphysical Society. Every variety of opinion was represented there; most of my colleagues were -ists of one sort or another; and I, the man without a rag of belief to cover himself with, could not fail to have some of the uneasy feelings which must have beset the historical fox when, after leaving the trap in which his tail remained, he presented himself to his normally elongated companions. So I took thought and invented what I conceived to be the appropriate title of 'agnostic.' "*

When the agnostic says that we cannot know anything about the reality beyond nature or experience, he implies that there *is* such a reality; and some, like Spencer, clearly accept this inference. To this extent they are *not pure naturalists.* They are only naturalists for all practical purposes: that is, since we can know nothing of supernature, we have nothing to do with it either in thought or conduct,—we can manage our lives as if it did not exist. At the same time, it is possible to maintain a sentiment of reverence toward the "Unknowable"; in this limited sense, the agnostic is often a profoundly religious man.

* Collected Essays, v, 237 f. Cf. Leslie Stephen, Agnostic's Apology.

63. Agnosticism is a position of compromise; it is accordingly unstable; it shows its weakness by various inconsistencies.

How can we keep ourselves to a vacuum of belief about any object we regard as real? The agnostic is often betrayed into expressing some ideas about that "Unknowable" reality, as is Herbert Spencer when he refers to it as an unknowable "Power," or when in saying that we cannot regard it as personal he remarks that the choice is between personality and something greater, not between personality and something less. If, as Kant and Schopenhauer alike maintain, the human mind cannot refrain from asking questions about what lies beyond experience, then these questions must be pertinent; and if they mean something, they must be capable of an intelligible answer.

We are urged by the more zealous agnostics, as a matter of intellectual duty, to keep our judgment in suspense about matters on which we have no evidence. "If a belief has been accepted on insufficient evidence, the pleasure is a stolen one. . . . It is sinful because it is stolen in defiance of our duty to mankind."* But what if the active man cannot do without some metaphysical belief? And what if this 'suspense of judgment' is, in effect, *judgment in the negative*, really a pretense of knowledge and not a 'suspense'? Spencer's ag-

* W. K. Clifford, quoted by William James, The Will to Believe.

nosticism, we have said, is equivalent to acting as if God does not exist. If scepticism is a luxury for the idle, agnosticism is an attempt to lock one's mind in prison from the outside. If reason cannot establish our beliefs, we shall find ourselves reaching convictions in some other way: we may become "*pragmatists.*" In simplest terms, pragmatism is that type of philosophy which *calls upon the will* to supplement the intellect in deciding questions of belief. This way of knowing has assumed a large influence in recent years. We shall study it as our second type.

TYPE II

PRAGMATISM

PRAGMATISM

Reference for reading

William James. Papers on Philosophy (Everyman's, No. 739), chs. vii (The Will to Believe) and x (What Pragmatism Means).

Literature of pragmatism

Protagoras. Bakewell, pp. 67, 78–84.
Kant, Critique of Practical Reason. Watson, J., Selections from Kant, 291–300. Rand, 473–481.
Fichte, J. G. First Introduction to Science of Knowledge. Rand, 486–496; esp. pp. 494–496.
Nietzsche, Friedrich. Beyond Good and Evil. Preface and ch. I.
Peirce, Charles. How to Make Our Ideas Clear. In "Chance, Love, and Logic," ed. M. Cohen.
Balfour, A. Foundations of Belief.
James, William. Pragmatism. The Will to Believe.
Schiller, F. C. S. Riddles of the Sphinx, chs. 5, 6. Humanism. Axioms as Postulates (in Personal Idealism).
Dewey, John. Influence of Darwin on Philosophy. Reconstruction in Philosophy. See also Studies in Logical Theory. 1903.

Criticism of pragmatism

Royce, J. The Eternal and the Practical. Philos. Rev. Mar., 1904. The problem of truth (in William James and other Essays). Philosophy of Loyalty, Lecture VII.
Pratt, James B. Pragmatism.
Perry, R. B. Present Philosophical Tendencies, Part IV.
Hocking, W. E. The Meaning of God, Preface and Parts II and III.
Montague, W. P. The Ways of Knowing, ch. V.
Boodin, J. E. Truth and Reality, chs. IX, X.

Chapter IX

WHAT PRAGMATISM IS

64. Pragmatism accepts the agnostic's judgment of the incompetence of 'pure reason' in metaphysics: the most important of our questions about the universe cannot be answered by way of proof or disproof; and there are no fixed axioms or *a priori* truths to serve as a firm base of certainty. But suspense of judgment is not alone a painful inner restraint: it is in some cases an impossibility, since one must act on some belief or other, and in other cases an impoverishment of life. May not the decision then be handed over to some court capable of reaching a verdict: what the contemplative intellect cannot do, may not the will or the active self accomplish? Pragmatism we may roughly define as *an appeal to the will* to achieve conclusions in vital matters of belief, or to aid in achieving them.

Pragmatism reminds us that thinking does not take place in a vacuum, or apart from the rest of life. It is itself a form of action; it may fairly be called a vital function; it has its part to play in securing survival, and also in securing all the rest of the good life that lifts us above the plane of mere existence. We think in order to live. Then our ideas, our beliefs, are to be regarded as work-

ing tools in this business of living well. What then is the function of philosophy in a man's life? Is it to produce some accurate picture of an inaccessible realm of supernature or of the hidden forces that manifest themselves in phenomena? But this, we are assured, is beyond the reach of our intellects. Then let us give up that picturing enterprise. But let us not stop at that point, as the agnostic does. Let us take belief in its total sense as something to live by (§1); and by whatever means we can reach our hypotheses, let us accept and use those beliefs which, by the test of personal and social experience, conduce to the promotion of living. Such beliefs we have a right to regard as true, though they cannot be established by any process of pure reason.

(This is the general idea of pragmatism. It divides in our own philosophic community into two main streams, according to what its exponents are chiefly *opposed to.*

Some are chiefly *opposed to rationalism.* They want first of all to get away from what they regard its deadening fixity, its formality, its support of dogmatic conventionality and a dumbly tenacious conservatism. They are all with the agnostics in the insistence that there are no eternal and *a priori* truths. But they add that if we are willing to hold everything flexible in the domain of philosophic principle we may work out a thoroughly adequate set of beliefs by simply extend-

ing and enlarging the well-tried methods of empirical science. We may become *experimentalists* in our beliefs, take them as working hypotheses, and hold them not as absolute and final verities, but as judgments to be freely modified by the tests of common experience. This is the variety whose acknowledged leader is Professor John Dewey.

Others are chiefly *opposed to agnosticism.* They reject its life-laming indecisiveness. They are repelled by the essentially dogmatic and dog-in-the-manger attitude of those who would set up the sign *Eingang verboten* at all belief which cannot be proved. Such thinkers are likely to take the direction of *voluntarism,* pleading the right of the active self to reach out for a positive metaphysics. They are more interested in the sources of belief than in the methods for testing belief. This is the variety whose leader in this country was William James.

These two branches, with their different interests, are likely to reach quite different metaphysical conclusions. So far as the theory of knowledge is concerned, there is nothing essentially incompatible between the two in the primary matters of principle. But in our own exposition, we shall lean toward the latter variety of pragmatism, chiefly on the ground that it is a more distinctive type. The former variety is in its chief contentions a quite natural development of *empiricism,* and is

properly designated experimentalism rather than pragmatism. We shall, however, keep both types in mind, so far as is consistent with the needs of a beginner.)

65. This way of reaching beliefs is far more wide-spread than the name; most men are influenced in favor of the beliefs they regard as valuable for practical purposes, or as helpful to human order and progress, or as suited to their general temper. Thus if one adopts a belief in God, not because there is conclusive evidence for it, but because it appears to him to add to the meaning of life, to dispel pessimism, or to encourage morality, he is so far a pragmatist. He has not reasoned his belief out, he has *chosen* it; and choice is an act of will. As Whiting Williams has well put it, "We live our way into our thinking, rather than think our way into our living."—(Very likely we do both.)

There was a strand of pragmatism in Tolstoi's philosophy.* Mussolini has recently acknowledged that he owes much to Nietzsche and William James for his method of reaching his political beliefs. They led him to discard "pure reason" or "*a priori* principles," and to adopt those policies which work out best in practice: the true policies are the expedient policies: this is political pragmatism.

Nietzsche goes so far as to say that a false-

* See Tolstoi's My Confession, Chapter xii.

hood, if life-preserving, is preferable to the truth. "The falseness of an opinion is not for us any objection to it. The question is, how far an opinion is life-furthering, life-preserving, species-preserving, perhaps species-rearing." This is merely Nietzsche's violent way of saying that belief in the form of prejudice, imagination, ideal, quite apart from the possibility of otherwise testing its truth, is a necessary condition of successful living. We men, both as individuals and societies, live best under the influence of a *myth* of some sort, a vision of the future which lures us on, making effort and sacrifice appear not only reasonable but exalting, whether or not these visions are even possible. Such myths are the Christian's Heaven, the Marxian Socialist's Ultimate Revolution, the Syndicalist's General Strike, the patriot's triumph of Liberty, the pacifist's warless world, all the various Utopias that have inspired history. William James would not subscribe to this doctrine of myth; he would not allow that we are justified in believing falsehoods or demonstrable fictions. He admits the will never as against reason, but only to tip a wavering scale, to finish what reason fails to effect. In such cases, his view is that the life-preserving proposition is the *true one*.

66. Pragmatism is often regarded as "the American philosophy." Ruggiero, a contemporary

Italian historian of philosophy, says, "Pragmatism was born in America, the country of business, and is, par excellence, the philosophy of the business man." But this view is mistaken. Just as there has been scepticism in all ages, so in all ages there has been a tendency to resort to the voluntary cast of belief as a relief from the negations of sceptical and agnostic views.

It is true that the name pragmatism (or pragmaticism, as Charles Peirce preferred to call it) was given vogue by William James; and that the pragmatic way of knowing was given a vigorous impetus by these American writers and by Professor John Dewey of Columbia. But Arthur Balfour in England (Foundations of Belief, 1895) and Professor Hans Vaihinger in Germany (Philosophy of the As-If), as well as Friedrich Nietzsche and Professor F. C. S. Schiller of Oxford, were bringing forward similar ideas at about the same time. William James described pragmatism as "a new name for old ways of thinking." Immanuel Kant and his great successor J. G. Fichte (1762–1814) had struck into the pragmatic groove long before any of these writers.

67. As an example of the predecessors of contemporary pragmatism, it is worth considering how Immanuel Kant emerged from the agnostic conclusions of the Critique of Pure Reason to the positive beliefs of the Critique of Practical Reason.

In the Critique of Pure Reason, Kant had come to the conclusion that we cannot prove the immortality of the soul, the freedom of the will, the existence of God. (Watson, Selections from Kant, 145–222; Rand, 424–456). In the Critique of Practical Reason, he argues as follows:

We cannot escape the fact of conscience. At least as certain as the fact that I exist (which Descartes had taken as the central certainty of experience) is the fact of obligation or duty. Whether other animals have a moral sense may be open to question; but man recognizes the meaning of the word "ought." To every man there is a clear difference between "I want to," "I must," and "I ought," though they may all apply to the same act.

Now if conscience is a fact, we must regard it as either valid or invalid. It is possible to regard it as inherited prejudice, or transmitted racial experience. (See, for example, Herbert Spencer, Data of Ethics, section 46.) In that case it has no more authority than the experience of our ancestors can have for a world in which conditions are constantly changing. But the evolutionary account of conscience is defective. Mental traits that come down to us from antiquity grow weaker as we recede from the source. But conscience, like the æsthetic sense, grows more sensitive, and gives rise from time to time to men of moral genius, who develop new ethical ideas. There is no doubt

a fund of inherited feeling which attends certain moral requirements which are deep rooted in the race, such as the revulsion against murder, unchastity, and perhaps theft. But conscience itself moves ahead of ancestral requirements, and hence cannot be explained away as a mere biological inheritance.*

We may, therefore, regard conscience as valid. Indeed, since the idea of "ought" has arrived in the mind, it is impossible to escape it except by using it. For if conscience is invalid, we ought not to be governed by it: that is, we appeal to the "ought" to overcome the "ought."

It is at this point that Kant stands. To him conscience is the one point of experience in which we touch absolute reality. Conscience is a token of something in man above nature, for it calls upon him to rule his own natural impulses. Nature appears in human nature in the form of instinct, impulse, desire and aversion: conscience recognizes these facts and calls on the individual man to take control, to govern them rather than to be governed by them. Professor George Herbert Palmer in teaching Philosophy 4 at Harvard defined conscience as the "call of the whole to the part." To Kant, it is the call of reality within the individual mind.

And if conscience is valid, then we are bound

* This paragraph is, of course, no part of Kant's discussion; it is a retrospective defense of Kant's starting-point, the validity of conscience.

to believe whatever is necessary to make it valid, that is, significant and binding.

68. In the first place, if nature ruled man, it would be mockery to call upon him to rule nature. There is no sense in "I ought" unless "I can." The moral law is invalid unless man is *free*. As Kant puts it, "I ought, therefore I can." If duty is required, freedom is required; that is, freedom is a "postulate" of conscience.

Again, the moral law requires not alone this act and that: It is concerned with what we are. It is not satisfied with anything short of perfection. For how could conscience acquiesce in imperfection? So long as I find that my duty is contrary to my inclination, I am not perfect. I cannot change duty: I may change my inclination. But to reach perfection, or holiness, will require infinite time, Kant argues. It will certainly require more than one lifetime. Hence, either the moral law requires the impossible (and is invalid), or else we must have the necessary time to fulfil its demands. *Immortality* is thus a second "postulate of practical reason."

Finally, while the individual is called upon to do his duty without regard to his own inclination, pleasure, fortune, happiness, so that the material rewards of existence are frequently to the corrupt or the compromising rather than to the dutiful, nevertheless, if this were the final truth of the

matter, no one could quite regard the universe as *just*. If conscience is rooted in reality, and not in illusion, then reality must be a *moral order:* and it must therefore bring about an agreement between morality and happiness. But the only power capable of doing this would be a power controlling the whole course of experience in this world and the next. That power is what men call God. Thus *God* is a third postulate of practical reason.

In brief, Kant argues, if I accept conscience as a genuine call of the universe to my individual self,—and duty begins in this acknowledgment of duty,—I must also accept the beliefs in God, freedom, and immortality. The moral will establishes what the intellect leaves in doubt.

(For this great argument of Kant, see Watson, 291–300; Rand, 473–481.)

69. Contemporary pragmatism differs from Kant's position in the following ways:

(1) Kant insists on the *necessity* of belief. Recent pragmatism emphasizes the rôle of *choice* in belief. This is a result of the fact that Kant believes that we can *reason* from the needs of our moral nature to the beliefs which alone can support it. We do not require to wait for experience to show us what we must believe. Contemporary pragmatism takes its instruction from experience.

(2) Kant allows only *moral interests* to de-

termine metaphysical belief, because he regards the moral sense as the only clew we have to reality. Recent pragmatism allows a *wide range of interests* to govern belief; in fact, no human interest is held irrelevant to belief.

(3) Kant appeals to the will to establish only these three ideas which belong to the *sphere of religion.* Contemporary pragmatism points out that fundamental *scientific beliefs* have the same foundation. We cannot prove that all events have a cause. We *postulate* this, in the interest of scientific knowledge.

The position of contemporary pragmatism is that we are employing all the time, not a few beliefs, but many beliefs which cannot be proved by pure reason. The scientist like the rest of us is "living by faith" in objects which cannot be directly observed nor discovered, "inaccessible objects" like ether, gravity, electrons, energy. Such beliefs can only be judged by their effect in guiding action: if they give us the right direction, they are true beliefs.

The same is true of our ethical and political beliefs. To Kant, the law of duty was the fixed point in the whole structure of belief; and specific moral laws, such as keeping promises, telling truth, respecting life, could be deduced from this unchanging law, the "categorical imperative." To the contemporary pragmatist, moral principles are neither immediately certain nor provable *a*

priori, but must be judged by their fruits in experience. Justice, chastity, democracy,—these principles are no more secure in reason than they are in traditional authority: they must be tried out. The good must be good *for something*, and must not attempt to shine by its own light. Here the pragmatist is inclined to join hands with the utilitarian and the naturalist in morals. (See Atlantic Monthly, November, 1926, Our Dissolving Ethics, by J. T. Adams; John Stuart Mill, Utilitarianism; Herbert Spencer, Data of Ethics, chapters iii and iv; Dewey and Tufts, Ethics, pp. 346–363.)

70. *What ideas mean.* American pragmatism begins in an attempt to go back of the question, Is a belief true? to the prior question, What does it mean?

In 1878, Charles Peirce published a paper in Popular Science Monthly on "How to make our ideas clear." He was impressed, as Spencer had been, with the fact that many of the ideas or terms with which our beliefs are concerned, such as force, free will, God, have no pictorial meaning. So far as mental images are concerned, they are simply "inconceivable." If that which we cannot picture is meaningless, we can save ourselves the trouble of asking whether God exists, by noting that the alleged idea of God is a meaningless word. But Spencer had already seen that the un-

picturable idea may nevertheless have a very definite meaning if it leads us to make predictions which can be verified. We cannot picture electricity; yet we can calculate how electricity will behave: electricity *means* the agent of these effects,—electricity is what electricity does. Charles Peirce extends this principle. The meaning of every idea which has no direct sense-imagery in it may be discovered—if it has any meaning—in the sense-effects it leads to.

"Let us seek a clear idea of Weight. To say that a body is heavy means simply that, in the absence of opposing force, it will fall. This is evidently the whole conception of weight" (Charles Peirce, Chance, Love and Logic, p. 47f).

Such a method relieves us at once of many puzzles in our perhaps forever fruitless efforts to guess what Weight may be *in itself*, or force in general, or free will, or God. Consider simply what effects these entities have in experience. If they have no effects, they have no meaning. If two such entities have the same effects, they have the same meaning, though they have different names. Thus Charles Peirce thinks there is no real difference of opinion between Catholics and Protestants in regard to the substance of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. To say that the wine and bread *are* the body and blood of Christ, and to say that they are mere symbols thereof, must mean precisely the same thing, so long as

(and if) the bread and wine have precisely the same qualities in each case and if the rite has the same emotional import.

As a matter of fact, many of our ideas which *have* a kernel of sense-imagery in their meaning, tend to reduce to directions for action. A certain bell means "Get up and go to breakfast"; its sound is forgotten, its "pragmatic meaning" remains. The red and green lights on the railroad are not thought of by the engineer as colors, but as directions for his conduct. The notes on the musician's score mean certain deeds with the bow or the fingers. Charles Peirce defines an idea as a "plan of action." And a belief giving some idea or other a definite status in the world,—"establishes in our nature a rule of action, or, say for short, a *habit*." What I believe about gravitation, for example, *means* the establishment of certain habits in handling things, in lifting, piling, building, walking, carrying, etc.

71. From this doctrine about what ideas and beliefs *mean*, it is but a step—though a momentous step—to the doctrine of William James about when a belief is *true:* namely, that a belief is true if it guides us to success, or establishes valuable habits. It is false if it leads us astray or establishes destructive habits.*

* Witnessing the new developments of pragmatism with some concern, Peirce commented that they were "lively," whereas "in order to be deep it is requisite to be dull! I make my pragmatism to be a mere maxim of logic, instead of a sublime principle of speculative philosophy."

It is evident that the theory of evolution would lend a certain support to this theory of truth. For evolution makes the intellect an organ in the struggle for existence: the mind must be an aid in survival, otherwise it would not exist. The value of a thought, then, would not lie in any pictorial resemblance to external things but solely in its leading to the fittest possible response to the environment. In themselves apart from the eye, physical things have no color; apart from the ear no sound. But for the purposes of successful action it is not necessary that the ripe apple should be red nor the unripe apple green: it is only necessary that this vitally important difference in the quality of the apple should be reported to the mind by *some* sign,—a color is as good as another sign. If life is "the adjustment of internal relations to external relations," of differences of behavior to differences of external fact, then the mind which has some *sign* for an external difference can be of service to life, even though its total picture of the world is nothing like the world as it is itself. Truth is the service of survival, in the first place, and then of all higher well being. The true is what "works" in this way.

Building on this biological view of the mind, Professor Dewey calls his type of pragmatism "Instrumentalism," that is, thought is to be considered simply as an instrument for promoting life, not as an organ for reaching a knowledge of

things as they are in themselves. And Professor Schiller calls his brand "Humanism," to indicate that whatever is true for the human being must serve human interests, and not the interests of any superhuman being.

72. In this recent pragmatism, the broad formula, "A belief is true if it works," needs to be made more definite. For the term "working" means different things in different situations. It means:

(*a*) "Cash-value." That is, to work is to lead to, or arrive at the actual facts of sensation, pleasure and pain, which the belief predicts.

Thus, the belief that the world is flat would lead me to think that if Springfield is west of Boston, and Albany west of Springfield, then Albany is west of Boston, and my shortest distance to Albany would be westward. This can be verified in the actual sense-experience of the journey, the cash-value of the belief, which is, so far, true. If I should argue that Pekin is west of Boston and London west of Pekin, and hence the shortest way to London is westward, the belief would encounter a negative cash-value, and would be proved false. When a scientific hypothesis can be verified by actual observation of conclusions drawn from it, this, its cash-value, establishes, or as some pragmatists would say, *is* its truth.

This is the empirical element in pragmatism.

The truth of every belief must be found in its report in the experience of the concrete observer, so far as it is capable of such test.

(*b*) Harmony with other propositions. We cannot take our beliefs simply one by one. It will not do to believe in one kind of an atom in physics, and in another kind in chemistry, though each belief works in its own field. If we accept inconsistent beliefs of this sort—and science has sometimes found itself doing so—it is with the understanding that they must be brought to agreement eventually.

A new belief about the world which is out of harmony with old beliefs (as Copernicus vs. Ptolemy) will either have to yield to the old, or make over the old on its own pattern. The total result must be consistent. And where, as in this case, either view is justified by its cash-value, the choice may be made on the ground of *simplicity*.

Thus the body of truth is continually changing. Each separate belief can be said to "work" only when it complies with both conditions: it must have its own "cash-value," and it must cohere with the other things we believe. (William James, Pragmatism, p. 61.)

(*c*) Higher values. Beside the effects of a belief in guiding the physical actions of our bodies, there are effects on feeling and attitude toward the world. A belief may give comfort or anxiety, stability or uncertainty, stimulus or repose, moral

resolve or moral laxity. Whenever, as in the case of religious beliefs, there is little or no sensible cash-value and they may be made to harmonize with other beliefs, these higher values may be the deciding factor. Thus, other things equal, a belief making for optimism rather than pessimism would be judged true. But note particularly that no pragmatist (unless with Nietzsche he recommends "vital lies") holds himself justified in choosing a belief on the score of these higher values if the two earlier tests decide its fate.

73. On the ground of these three tests of truth, the truth for one man would tend to resemble, but not necessarily to be identical with, the truth for another. Thus, the amount of risk in the world which would stimulate one man might discourage another: it might work for the former to believe in a world of chance, and for the latter to believe in a world of divine providence.

Taken literally, pragmatism would encourage each man to adopt the belief which works best for him, regardless of its agreement with any other person's belief. It would thus accept a thoroughgoing *relativity* of truth; and a man's philosophy would quite rightly depend on his temperament and circumstances.

But evidently it does not altogether work to be out of accord with one's neighbor, any more than to be out of accord with oneself. To work per-

fectly, a belief must be in harmony with other propositions (the second test); but it must also be in harmony with the beliefs of other people.

Hence "individual pragmatism" tends to give way to "social pragmatism," which holds that belief to be true which works for the great majority of men (ultimately for all men) in the long run. The truth of a belief would then only be determined by a long course of *social experiment.*

The social form is the prevailing type of pragmatism in America to-day. Just as Dean Pound's "sociological jurisprudence" judges those laws to be right which are shown to lead to the maximum realization of interests, all interests being considered and weighed, so Professor Dewey's school in Columbia, Chicago and elsewhere judges those beliefs true in religion, ethics, metaphysics, which experience shows to promote the welfare of the mass of mankind after long trial. Dewey himself would add that nothing transcendental or otherworldly can satisfy these conditions. William James thought that some form of theism is requisite for human happiness. (Reflex Action and Theism in The Will to Believe and Other Essays.)

Chapter X

PRAGMATISM EXAMINED

74. We can best make sure that we understand pragmatism by trying it on a number of beliefs.

Mussolini makes a pragmatic judgment that democracy is a failure, that is, a false belief. It was not working in Italy. Is he right? Has democracy been tried? Has monarchy been tried? Has any form of government been tried *enough?* Can we judge Christianity pragmatically? When the late war broke out, it was said on many sides, Christianity has failed. The judgment was pragmatic. But has it been tried?

Can history yield a pragmatic proof of any belief?

Or take a simpler belief, that in immortality. How shall we judge the truth of this on pragmatic grounds? Kant saw but one aspect of this belief: it allows room for moral perfection. May it also allow room for eternal degradation? It may promise eternal bliss, or eternal pain, remorse, ennui. It may stimulate to high effort, or lead to loitering, since there is eternity for every task. According to the *kind* of future life, and not merely the fact of future life, will be its influence on this life. In the past, associated with the be-

lief in rewards and punishments, it has upheld law and ecclesiastical authority. It has held societies together, and strengthened the arm of war. Can we sum up the good and the evil and strike the balance? And is this the way to judge the truth of the case?

75. To determine whether pragmatism meets our idea of the way to determine truth, take the following test-cases:

(1) *The lost trace.* Which of the two propositions is true: There was a man named Homer, There was not a man named Homer? Ordinary logic and common sense require that one or the other must be true. But suppose that no evidence can be found for or against either proposition, all traces being lost. Then neither proposition has any cash-value in terms of facts; and neither has any advantage in terms of harmony with other beliefs, or of meeting our higher needs and wishes. Then, by the pragmatic method, neither is true and neither is false; but having no consequences and "making no difference" both are devoid of meaning. If we continue to believe that one must be true and the other false, we have some other than the pragmatic idea of truth.

The liar is the person who endeavors to exploit lost traces. For the actual course of past events, he substitutes a fictitious course which will fit in with all the facts other people know, and so 'work' for them, while working vastly better for him-

self. The cross-examination of a witness is an effort to discover whether his story does fit all the facts known by others, and most liars fail somewhere by this pragmatic test. But suppose there were a super-liar, a perfect liar: then would his story be true? This case leads naturally to the next,—

(2) *The perfect imitation*. There are in practice few perfect imitations. But one coin is very nearly a duplicate of another. Suppose, then, that two men at the bank receive in exactly similar bags the same number of new coins; and suppose that, without knowing it, each takes the other's bag. Pragmatically, there is nothing to shake the belief that each has the bag that was given him. Are these beliefs then true? If not, we must get some other definition of truth.

In this case, nothing hangs on the identity of the two bags, and one is not forced to reach an opinion. But there are cases in which identity is highly valued. The perfect copy of a Rembrandt successfully marketed would lose almost all of its value if it were known to be merely a perfect imitation. This is illustrated by the story of the collector whose enemy, instead of stealing his priceless old painting, drove him to a deeper despair by making so exact a duplicate of it that the collector was unable to tell which was the original. When the interest is in individual identity, a pragmatic equivalence fails to satisfy.

(3) *The multiconsistent universe*. It is con-

ceivable that there are several hypotheses about the nature of things which work equally well, all of them being consistent with all the facts. Fichte thought that there were two systems of philosophy of this sort: Spinoza's system of rigid determinism, and the idealistic system of freedom. Your choice between them would depend on what kind of person you are. (Rand, 489, 492–496.) Suppose that there are many such consistent views, such that one works best for one man, another for another. Are they all true? The person who makes such an hypothesis cannot maintain that they are are all true; for to him the truth is that character of the world which allows it to assume these various appearances. The truth about the color of the chameleon is not any one of its colors, but that quality which enables it to vary.

It is evident that the human mind aims at a kind of truth that is independent of its wishes, and even beyond its power of testing.

76. The central trouble with pragmatism seems to be that when we choose our belief, it ceases to be our belief.

The suspicion that our will has tipped the balance of evidence brands for us the chosen hypothesis as *subjective;* but a belief is the reference of the mind to an object assumed real, independent, objective. The suspicion of subjectivity therefore destroys belief.

The logical error of pragmatism may be stated

as a "false conversion" of "All true propositions work" into "All propositions that work are true." This conversion is not logically allowable. From All crows are black birds, it does not follow that All black birds are crows. It only follows that No bird which is not black is a crow. Or in the present case, No proposition which does not work is true. Thus a *negative pragmatism* is of use in detecting the presence of error, though positive pragmatism cannot establish truth. (See The Meaning of God, p. xiii.)

There is one situation in which it would be allowable to convert the proposition. All equilateral triangles are equiangular and also All equiangular triangles are equilateral. This is because the classes named in the subject and the predicate coincide in extent. So if the true propositions and the working propositions were identical, we could take working as a test of truth. Now if we could assume that the universe is entirely benevolent, as we understand benevolence, or entirely fit for our existence, the true beliefs would be at the same time life-promoting, comforting, etc., and the pragmatic test would be approximately valid. The value of pragmatism would thus depend on an antecedent piety, not piety on pragmatism. The original belief in the fitness of the world could not be pragmatically established; for it must be used to establish pragmatism.

Ultimately, then, pragmatism requires a non-

pragmatic truth. It fails by its own test. (See The Meaning of God, p. 206.)

77. Let us see how these considerations apply to each of the three fields, ethics, science, religion.

In ethics (§65, above), pragmatism attempts to judge what is right by what works well, as making for "the greatest good of the greatest number," or some other measure of welfare. Now no one would hold a mode of action to be right which made for the extermination of the race (Schopenhauer excepted). But we cannot judge what is right by what promotes welfare or survival or happiness, because we can only determine what promotes welfare, etc., by first enquiring what is right.

Since the war, we have been increasingly conscious of the necessity of 'morale' in industry, politics, etc., as a precondition of all social welfare. And morale is a state of the will of the members of a social group in which each is willing to act in good faith for the objects which the group is pursuing. But men will not identify themselves in this way with their groups unless they are persuaded of the justice of the group, its good faith with them. The only prosperous group is one in which the leaders and the members first take upon themselves something like the Kantian law of duty. This law, then, is not contrary to welfare, but *prior* to welfare.

The existence of such a law of right is exceedingly fortunate for the conduct of life, if only because the calculation of the effects of action is impossible; both because of the infinite series of effects, and because of the qualitative difference of effects (See J. S. Mill, Utilitarianism), and because there is no way to weigh pleasures against pains. (See Lecky, History of European Morals, ch. 1.)

78. In science, it is important to make the distinction between verifying an hypothesis by the test of facts (cash-value as in §72, above) and choosing an hypothesis because we like or approve of it. There is no real reason for claiming the process of verification as peculiar to pragmatism. An hypothesis is verified by finding out what facts would follow from it, and then looking to the facts to see whether they are as the hypothesis demands. The procedure is one of strict logical deduction and observation, from which the human equation is excluded as rigorously as possible.

Of course, science bears the mark of human interest: the truths it enquires into are the truths it concerns us to know. Our interest motivates the questions; but it does not determine the answers. The unfavorable answer is taken as well as the favorable. It is the part of science to tell us the worst as well as the best about the world. And the principle of scientific truth is that no human in-

terest, however great, can outweigh any item of evidence, however small.

It is probable that our interest in natural laws and the regular order of nature is due to the practical advantage of operating in a reliable environment. It is also probable that our ideas of atoms, electrons, etc., are worked out so persistently, because our practical interest in recombining the things of the world requires us to know the elements. The assumption that there *are* laws and elements may have a practical motive. But this assumption does not control what we find: it does not make the regularity we discover, nor exclude the irregularity which we may be obliged to admit. The whole significance of the effort to *know* the "laws" and the "things" of nature lies in their indifference to our wishes.

Pragmatism, therefore, can claim no support from the ordinary procedures of scientific method; and in so far as Instrumentalism is an extension of scientific method it is not peculiarly pragmatic.

79. The pragmatic element in Instrumentalism is its substitution of a plastic set of ideas to be experimentally verified for the stable truths of rationalism; its recognition that transition, change, invades the most permanent of our intellectual properties. Now observe: we all believe in the pervasiveness of change; and we all believe in experimentation. If Instrumentalism meant

simply the growth of the experimental spirit in thought and in life, everybody would be an Instrumentalist. But the question is, *How much?* Does everything pass, and does everything change at once? Is *all* that I believe true to-day to be false to-morrow; and on that account shall I hold nothing as certain? Then we must part company with Instrumentalism.

For the idea of an experiment itself requires that something does *not* move, namely the conditions which make the experiment significant. The x which the mathematician uses in his equation must keep the same value throughout the problem,—otherwise the operations become meaningless. The mind which experiments must remain the same, and mean the same by its enquiry when it ends as when it began; otherwise the experiment is irresponsible. And in so far as some problems remain throughout the life of the individual and of the race, there must be some *constants* in the life of men and of society. To make every habit and foundation tentative, and every standard provisional, would be like living in a house which was sliding in its place and melting over our heads. Further, all experiment has for its object to *establish* something, to learn something which will stay learned, once we have it. Truth must be cumulative in the race; but to accumulate, there must be an element of permanence in

what is gained. If what we learn by experiment is to be at once unlearned, the motive to learn it is destroyed at its root.

And to experiment with experimentalism, we find that in casting away all stability of principle, we are obliged to introduce into our living stability of another sort. Mussolini abandons the fixity of political principles; and resorts to another absolutism, that of the particular I-will. Stability of principle instead of stability of force has the pragmatic advantage that it allows flexibility and growth. The experimental ideal itself requires a non-experimental background.*

80. In religion and metaphysics generally pragmatism may seem to have its strongest claim, because of the difficulty of finding any other ground of belief. It is strengthened by the close alliance between religion and poetry. For we may conceive art either, with Taine, as a region of release from the sordidness of facts in a certain play of perfection, in which case a religious belief would be a higher form of art; so Santayana interprets it (Interpretations of Poetry and Religion). Or else we might regard it as a presentation of an ideal to be realized in action, and so a desirable support to the will to achieve, as well as to the will to be moral. But the history of religion opposes this view. The advance of religion

* See further §268.

is an advance out of poetry into literality. The turning point in the history of religion seems to have come when a certain carpenter began to enquire under what conditions the last myth of his people might have a literal meaning. (See The Meaning of God, 150–152.)

It is particularly in religion that the objective truth is the only thing that can set us free. For religion is the orientation of the human self to what it regards as the most real thing in the world. God is nothing if not that on which we depend. But every chosen belief, every man-made idea of God such as Voltaire's saying suggests, too palpably depends on us. We cannot swing up a rope which is attached only to our own belt. If we can get no evidence in religious matters, we must go without it; for here most of all the possibility of a negative answer to our hopes must be kept open. Here most of all a chosen belief ceases to be a belief, and so fails to 'work.'

81. Pragmatism, we conclude, is not the final answer to the question, how we are to get our beliefs. It is not, on that account, without value.

It has called attention to the fact that truth is an enterprise which requires active effort, not passive waiting to be convinced. The surgeon, not knowing whether an operation will save a life, will never find out by "suspending judgment": he must adopt a working hypothesis, and act on it.

Only, we must distinguish between the will to reach truth, and the will to decide truth. Our decision does not make the truth true.

Again, it has called attention to the fact that there is a great region of the world which is unfinished and plastic, and where our action changes the facts. Treating a man as if he were an enemy may make him an enemy; treating him as a friend may make him such. In such cases the subjective factor of will makes the difference between one truth and another. "Is this enterprise a success or a failure?" It is neither the one nor the other until you act: your will to believe it a success may decide the issue. Here pragmatism has its rightful field.

But for the rest, where the character of the universe is in question, we must always distinguish between our working hypotheses and our beliefs. Action cannot wait, and must seize on the best hypotheses available: the will to believe is a precept for the life of action, but not for thought. For thought has all of time in which to reach its results.

This age-long effort we have no right to relinquish in despair. Pragmatism acquiesces too easily in the agnostic view of metaphysical truth. The presumption is that whatever in the universe can affect us is connected with us by lines which our knowledge can trace. *There is no inaccessible truth.*

TYPE III

INTUITIONISM

INTUITIONISM

Reference for reading

Bergson, Henri. An Introduction to Metaphysics (Putnams), 1–43; Creative Evolution (Rand, 852–885).

Literature of Intuitionism

Plato. Symposium. Republic, Book VII (Bakewell, 203–212).
Boethius. Consolations of Philosophy, v.
Spinoza, Short Treatise, Part II, chs. i, ii, xxi, xxii.
Kant. Critique of Judgment (Watson, Selections, 307 ff.).
Schelling, F. W. J. System of Transcendental Idealism, §§ 3, 4 (Rand, 541–546). Philos. Briefe, viii.
Schopenhauer, A. World as Will and Idea (Rand, 639–644; 670–671).
Bergson, H. Time and Free Will, chs. ii, iii; Creative Evolution; Laughter, pp. 150–170.

Critique of Intuitionism

Bennett, C. A. Bergson's Doctrine of Intuition. Phil. Rev., January, 1916.
Hocking, W. E. The Significance of Bergson. Yale Review, Jan., 1914.
Montague, W. P. The Ways of Knowing.
LeRoy, E. Science et Philosophie. Rev. de Métaphysique, 1899.
Hamilton, Sir William. Discussions on philosophy and literature (Criticism of Victor Cousin).
Mill, John Stuart. Examination of Hamilton, chs. iv, v, xxiv.
Aliotta. Idealistic Reaction Against Science, 115–150.

Chapter XI

FEELING AS AN ORGAN OF KNOWLEDGE

82. The agnostic, the pragmatist and the intuitionist agree in one thing: they distrust the capacity of the intellect to reach metaphysical truth. But while the agnostic in this situation proposes to get along without a metaphysical belief, and the pragmatist, seeing that some such belief is inescapable, chooses one for its value, the intuitionist points out that we have other resources for knowledge than the intellect. He resorts not to will but to what is sometimes vaguely called 'feeling.' In order to see what intuition is, it will be well to consider the nature of feeling.

83. Feeling is an ambiguous term. It is some times used as an equivalent for emotion and sensibility: 'the feeling of grief or joy,' 'to hurt a person's feelings.' It is also used to indicate a kind of knowledge, belonging to touch or akin to touch: 'the surface feels rough,' 'he felt that their attitude was unfriendly.' This ambiguity arises from the fact that intellect and will are developed from a more primitive type of mentality in which these two functions are not clearly separated. Feeling is a fit name for this primitive mentality.

Its place in the mind can be seen by considering certain differences revealed by *language* between the human mind and the minds of animals.

84. Animals have language: they communicate by signs, and in the gregarious species these signs may be intricate and subtle: we are by no means sure we know all about them. But in general we may say that the language of animals is a language of *interjections*. There is a call which implies "Danger"; a call which implies "Food," etc. An interjection or exclamation gives a total meaning in a single sign.

Human language establishes signs for *fragments* of meaning. A word is a sign for an object which, in general, only serves to make up a complete meaning when set with other words. The units of human language are combined and recombined in various ways to make sentences. And the declarative sentence itself is not, for action, a complete meaning. The proposition, "The prairie is on fire," strongly suggests action, but does not define it. It leaves open the possible question, "What to do," and thus a possible variety of suggestions and a clash of judgment. Thus the exclamation "Fire!" conveys a more complete meaning than the sentence; for it assumes an appropriate action and intends to summon it. The declarative sentence, so far as I can judge, has no existence in animal language. Human language

is analytical; it allows the poise of intellect in the abeyance of action. Animal language is total: in it knowledge and active-attitude are unseparate. It directs the communal operations of instinct: it is at once announcement and command. In brief, it is the language of feeling; and feeling thus appears as *undifferentiated mentality.*

Psychology has for some time been critical of that division of mental powers which treated intellect, feeling, and will as three distinct and coördinate functions. It has pointed out that feeling, as emotional disturbance, is the beginning of action, and so *merges with will.* This is seen with especial clearness in the case of those feelings which are closely associated with instincts. The feeling of fear is the early stage of those reactions which lead to flight or concealment. The feeling of anger is the incipient form of hostility. But is is equally true that these feelings emerge insensibly from the *cognition* or knowledge which (as the 'stimulus') calls forth the reaction. Fear and anger contain a keen and heightened awareness of unfavorable situations. We cannot therefore hand over the feelings to the active phase of the mind to the exclusion of the cognitive or knowing phase. Feeling partakes of both characters: it is a disturbing *knowledge;* it is a recognition that the world is unbalanced and calls for action; it is an idea moving toward an act of will. Feeling, then, we shall regard as neither coördi-

nate with intellect and will, nor merged with will, but as the simpler state of mind from which intellect and will are differentiated:

Feeling → Intellect (Human aspect)
Feeling → Will (Animal aspec

86. We do not, of course, say that animals are devoid of intellect. Still less do we say that human beings are comparatively weak in feeling. On the contrary, in spite of the fact that intellect and will play a proportionately larger rôle in human life than in animal life, feeling is a large factor in every man's conduct,—in some, perhaps the chief factor. And the character of feeling which now concerns us is that

Wherever there is feeling, there is cognition.

that is to say, some knowledge or judgment about the objective world.

The truth of this we have just noticed with regard to fear and anger, as feelings closely connected with instinct. Both fear and anger may be based on fictitious or imaginary grounds. But the point is that whoever experiences these emotions believes certain judgments to be true; destroy the belief and you destroy the emotion. One has to *know* something to be angry,—to recognize something as an injury, a menace, an affront: a man

may be too wise to be angry, he may also be too stupid. Anger contains knowledge of some sort. The same is true of more general feelings, such as melancholy, laughter, sympathy.

Laughter is highly cognitive: it is impossible unless there is a certain rapid concentration of knowledge, as in "seeing the point" of a joke. Laughter engages one's entire view of the world; but to excite laughter this view must work instantaneously and unlaboriously. Hence satire—an unlabored application of philosophy—is often the most effective form of criticism; and Shaftesbury wisely demanded that all good things should be able to endure the "test of ridicule" and come through unhurt. If America has any peculiar philosophy of the method of knowledge, it is not pragmatism: it is rather the belief that insight is better than argument; and that insight can be condensed in wit. Wit is finding the shortest way to the point; and laughter is the joy of release.

Sympathy, as feeling with another, contains the true knowledge of the other's state of mind. The unsympathetic person is blind to some of the important facts of the world. If intellect is "cold" it is not merely because it lacks emotional color: it is because it lacks truth. The cold or unfeeling individual is somewhere stupid or dense.

In sum, feeling appears to contain some essential element of truth, needful in our adjustment to reality.

87. Now we are concerned with possible sources of metaphysical knowledge. Why, then, turn back to that primitive type of knowledge contained in feeling which man has in common with lower animals? Intellect, as the capacity for analysis and invention, no doubt represents an advance. But feeling, as the total response to the total situation, may have its advantages which *ought not to be lost* in this advance.

We know that the instincts of animals—without indulging in any superstitious wonder about them—often show an extraordinary keenness in sensing the environment: their perceptions frequently surpass our own and leave us puzzled as to "how they know." Bergson's interest is attracted by the canny conduct of the insect world. (See his discussion of instinct and intelligence in Creative Evolution, ch. ii, in which he quotes from Fabre, Peckham on Wasps, and others.) Animals presumably have no theories; but in the feeling-knowledge which accompanies instinct there must be a prevailingly true sense of situations—otherwise the instinctive life would not be successful. "L'action ne saurait se mouvoir dans l'irréel" (L'évolution créatrice, p. iv).

Now each separate instinct, as food-getting, nest-building, migrating, is occupied not with the whole environment, but with some fraction of it. But all the specific instincts are branches of a total instinct, the orientation of the animal to-

ward its life-task. This total or root-instinct may be called, with Schopenhauer, the will to live: it may better be called the will to do one's living well, to realize the idea of the species in one's own career.* To this instinct there corresponds a feeling of the total environment of life: it may properly be called the sense of reality.

May it be possible that this feeling, presumably very vague in the animal world, and yet definite enough to sustain the vital effort of the creature, may become in the human being a valuable organ of knowledge? May it be that this "total response to the total situation" ought to accompany and supplement all the efforts of the intellect? It is this that intuitionists believe.

* On the unity of instinct, see Hocking, Human Nature, chapters ix–xi.

Chapter XII

THE APPEAL TO INTUITION

88. Reliance on intuition in metaphysics is more ancient than reliance on intellect. The earliest sages announce to mankind not what they are are ready to prove, but what they see. As "seers," their teachings are dogmatic. Confucius sees, and states dogmatically, that "The good man forms a triad with Heaven and Earth"; Buddha sees, and states dogmatically, that "the craving for individuality is the source of suffering." Religious "revelation" is the dogmatic statement of what the prophet has caught sight of: it is his 'vision.'

And the beginnings of non-religious metaphysical thought are of the same sort: the effort to 'think,' or to contemplate, is often simply an effort to see, i. e., to adjust the instrument, to get rid of distraction, to concentrate the mind, so that seeing takes place. The famous doctrine of Thales in which Greek philosophy takes its beginning, that "all things are manifestations of one thing; and that one thing is like water," was presumably an announcement of an intuition, rather than a result of demonstration such as Thales used in geometry. It was the vision of a thinking mind, but none the less an intuition.

Since intuition is the oldest source of metaphysics, it is natural that as philosophy became more and more a matter of intellect and reason, any dissatisfaction with reason should provoke a resort to intuition. An age of scepticism, we said, is likely to bring about some expression of pragmatism: it is still more likely to evoke the intuitionist. And it frequently happens in the history of philosophy that a thinker, after having gone as far as his reason will take him, relies on intuition for his final reach of truth. Thus Plato (Symposium, 211; The Republic, 515, 532–535) regards the 'dialectic' as a progressive rational enquiry destined to usher the mind to a direct vision of reality.

89. In the Middle Ages, the chief source of metaphysical truth was commonly defined as *faith*; and philosophy, as a work of the intellect, was frequently regarded as merely an auxiliary support to faith, the "handmaid of theology." This faith was a direct apprehension of truth, whether on the part of the one who originally receives the authoritative revelation, or on the part of the believer who appropriates it; it was a form of intuition.

It is true—as pragmatism has pointed out—that faith was regarded as a virtue, and so implied an act of will: one must have the loyal resolve to accept the truth and act upon it, else he

will not find it. But it is also true that what this faithful will seeks is not a *resolve:* it is a perception or insight. "Faith is the substance of things hoped for, the becoming evident of things not seen (with the physical eye)." Faith is thus an intuition; and while its discoveries could never be contrary to reason, they might well be *beyond reason.*

90. If distrust of reason leads to an appeal to intuition, an excessive confidence in reason will provoke the same appeal by way of protest.

Never was "Reason" more generally and enthusiastically trusted than in the France of the Enlightenment. And it was this very Age of Reason which gave birth to *Rousseau*, the apostle of feeling. Repelled by the prevalent mechanical account of human nature as a physically regulated procession of ideas, he rejected the method of thought which solemnly brought forward such a caricature as a true portrait. The feeling of individuality within us, he thought, would give us a better truth; intuition shows us our own minds not as fabrics of ideas spun out on a loom of necessity, but as spontaneous and unitary agents of sentiment and will.

Germany also had its apostle of intuition, during this same period, in the person of *Jacobi* (F. H. Jacobi, 1743–1819), sometimes called the "faith-philosopher." He was stirred to protest by the philosophy of Spinoza, the purest of ration-

alists: it seemed to him that the unaided intellect must necessarily lead to atheism and fatalism, because in its own nature it can only deal with finite and partial objects, putting them into systematic connection, but is unable to get the raw material of truth, particularly the truth about the whole of things. A God who could be proved would be no God at all: for intellectual knowledge is a sort of mastery or taking possession, and the supreme being cannot be thus mastered. Metaphysical truth must be reached, not by the 'mediate' knowledge of ideas, but by immediate perception. Jacobi called this direct knowledge *Glaube*, faith: it is what we mean by intuition. Thus by his criticism of Spinoza, he was prepared to meet the agnosticism of Kant's first Critique by recommending the intuitive way of knowing in metaphysics.

91. But Kant himself came very near to recognizing what Jacobi meant by faith, and what we mean by intuition. In his second Critique he had touched the vein of pragmatism,—belief by the necessity of the moral will. In his third and in many ways his greatest Critique (The Critique of Judgment, 1790) he comes to a view that belief may be grounded on the necessities of *feeling*.

But here, as usual, Kant strikes a new note. For the feelings he has in mind are our *æsthetic* feelings, our sense of the beautiful and the fit. And his proposition is that these feelings are a

form of "judgment" (Urteilskraft): they imply some knowledge or discernment, which it is the business of his study to ferret out. He comes to the conclusion that our feeling of the fit and worthful in nature is due to presence of *organic life*, which we can only think of as a product of some teleological principle. (See Watson, Selections from Kant, 307–349). So Kant asserts that our feeling of deference to and regard for living nature is a dim recognition of some metaphysical background of life, which we might term God.

But Kant hesitates to give free rein to this intuition. He speculates (§ 77) on the possibility that some higher type of mind might possess an 'intellectual perception' which, so far from confirming this teleological judgment, would dispense with it! He admits feeling into metaphysics only to shut it out again. But he had let fall a suggestion eagerly adopted by some of his successors, notably Schelling and Schopenhauer.

92. Schopenhauer's entire system of philosophy is based on the belief that while the scientific intellect only presents us with the surface of things,—appearances, phenomena, set in an understandable connection with each other, we have an immediate or intuitive knowledge of reality in our own minds, and know this reality to be of the nature of will. He taught, furthermore, that by a discipline of art, altruism, and ascetic self-sac-

rifice, the mind of the race might eventually be brought to the ultimate intuition of the vanity of existence and reabsorption in the cosmic will. (Rand, Modern Classical Philosophers, pp. 639–644, and 670–671.)

But it is Schelling (1775–1854) who most completely grasped and used the Kantian suggestion that our æsthetic sense may contain a perception of the ultimate truth of things, that the genius of the artist is a gateway to metaphysical knowledge, and "art the organon of philosophy." (Rand, pp. 544–546.)

Unfortunately, Schelling's views on this point were neglected, and Schopenhauer's pessimism attracted greater interest than his doctrine of intuition. The nineteenth century, under the spell of an advancing naturalism, was inclined to see in intuition nothing but another name for uncontrolled imagination. Its alliance with art was generally regarded as an alliance with irresponsible literary dilettantism in philosophy. Schelling was one of the Romanticists. It is only through the work of Bergson in our own day that the method of intuition once more receives a respectful hearing. For Bergson unites in himself the scientific care of the student of mathematics with the sensibility of poetic insight.

Chapter XIII

BERGSON

93. Henri Bergson (1859–) conceived in his student days at the École Normale at Paris an ambition to reach an accurate understanding of the fundamental concepts of physics,—time, space, matter, motion, force, energy. He was led, in the pursuit of this aim, to a discovery which turned the current of his life, namely, that the *time* which enters into physical equations is not real time; and that real time is to be known, not by the measuring and standardizing intellect, but by a direct perception of the passage of our inner life. This direct perception he afterward gave the name of intuition.

This was an intellectual conversion for him, because it meant an escape from naturalism. It appeared to him, as it had appeared to Jacobi, that naturalism and determinism are results of intellectual method; but that something is missed by this method. Real time is missed. And the real self is also missed; for the real self lives in the flow of time: its states are not strung along in causal succession, but interpenetrate, carry their past with them in such wise that each one involves the whole self. The life of the self is thus not me-

chanically determined. This important result Bergson announced in his first book, Time and Free Will (Les données immédiates de la conscience, 1889.) This emancipation Bergson has been able to communicate to many others. One commentator says of him that he is the first to make an effective breach in the defences of naturalism. His weapon is the generalized method of intuition.

94. The importance of Bergson lies in the fact that he tries to give an exact definition to the elusive method of intuition and to indicate the wide range of objects to which it applies. He states his view of intuition best in the article (1903) which is translated as "Introduction to metaphysics."

He makes it clear that intuition is not the "feeling sure" of some proposition or other. It is perception of an actually present object. It is an extension of "sense perception" to the region beyond sense: it might be called simply perception of what is invisible and intangible but nevertheless actual. Thus, time cannot be perceived by the senses; yet time, according to Bergson, can be perceived by intuition.

What objects, then, can intuition perceive? Motion and all forms of change; for time enters into their constitution. The self. Living beings beyond self, animals, other persons,—whatever can be an

object of "sympathetic intelligence." Further, fragments of life that have life in them, and products of life; books, characters of drama, acts of skill. Possibly, as a rare and extreme achievement, the central pulse of the life of the world in its unity,—for Bergson believes that there is such a thing, the vital impetus or *élan vital.*

Can we give a general definition of these objects? They must be objects which have an 'inside' and an 'outside'; for intuition perceives them inwardly, while intellect judges them outwardly. They must be objects which have a complex aspect and a simple aspect: for intellect analyzes them, while intuition grasps them simply and as a unit. They are all objects, then, which have some organic character, binding a manifold into a unity; and conversely, all such objects can be known by intuition.

95. But what are the defects of the intellect which prevent it from attaining an adequate knowledge of these objects? They have been touched upon from time to time: let us assemble them.

(1) Intellectual knowledge is *external.*

The intellect approaches an object from outside, i.e., from other objects, and considers it as like these others or different from them. I see a palm for the first time: I am undecided whether it is a tree or a vegetable; in either case I am try-

ing to think of it in terms of other objects I am acquainted with. I will end by classifying it, knowing it by its resemblance to other trees, bringing it under the *concept*, tree. The concept is the typical achievement of intellectual knowledge. But evidently one can see likenesses, and make concepts, without getting any intimate sense of the life of the tree.

(2) Intellectual knowledge is *relative*.

To know a thing by way of its likeness to something else is to know it in relation to that other thing. It is also to know it in relation to *the interest* which led me to see that likeness. I am interested in foliage; and so I observe that a palm, having foliage, is like other trees. But if I am a wood-cutter or a lumber merchant, I am more likely to class the palm with the vegetables, for I can make no wood of it. Every concept or class thus represents a 'point of view,' a particular interest. Like the publisher's concept of a book as a commodity having a good or bad sale, it does not pretend to know the book *as it is*, but only in relation to a certain interest. It is thus a relative and not an absolute knowledge.

(When, as in this case, the interest is practical, the resulting knowledge may be said to be pragmatic. The book is to the publisher what it does for him; and his idea is true if it works. To Bergson, the whole of physical science has a practical motive: we consider the world with the ques-

tion, how can I move in it, construct and control things in it. Hence the concepts of physical science are pragmatic. This explains why Bergson is sometimes counted among the pragmatists; but it is evident that this is not the characteristic aspect of his philosophy.)

(3) Intellectual knowledge is *abstract* and *partial*. Any point of view is one among an indefinite number of possible points of view; and the truth that can be got from any one of them is but a part of the whole truth.

I may conceive the cherry as a fruit, from the point of view of a botanist or of a cook. From that of a painter, it may be a bit of still life or of decoration. To a small boy, it may be classed among the projectiles or the pigments. It is all of these things, and more. Any one of these concepts gives a ruinously incomplete knowledge of the cherry.

In another sense the very outlining of the object is an abstraction: for the living cherry can only be understood as a part of the life of the cherry-tree. As conceived it is cut out, *découpée*, from the environment in which alone it is itself.

(4) Intellectual knowledge represents its objects as *static* and therefore *dead*.

It is essential to the concept that it remain the same forever. A meaning cannot change its meaning without becoming some other meaning; that is, it cannot change. Trees may change, but the

idea of a tree is permanent. The concept therefore cannot do justice to the changing thing. To comprehend motion, it tries to assemble states of rest. To comprehend life, it tries to catch fixed units and laws. It must fail. "Tous les cadres craquent" (Ev. Cr. p. ii).

(5) In sum, intellect *analyzes*, and cannot recompose. It can dismember the organism, but it cannot from the parts restore the living whole.

96. In all these respects, intuition is the precise counterpart of intellect. It therefore succeeds where intellect fails. In particular, it is the specific answer to the troubles arising from the "relativity of knowledge"; for it dispenses with points of view, comparisons, special interests, and seeks an immediate rapport with the object in its own being. Its knowledge may therefore be described as immediate and absolute.

Intuition also promises to settle the dispute between the empiricist and the rationalist. For both of these employ the intellectual method. The empiricist in studying a living thing, say the self, reports it as made up of a multitude of 'states': he thinks he is reporting pure observation, but he is the victim of his analytical intelligence. The rationalist asserts the unity of the self: but unity as an idea of reason is merely an abstract numerical quality which the self would have in common with a post or a stone. Both are relative truths;

and both can only contribute to a true knowledge of the self when they yield to intuition, which alone is capable of getting beneath these generalities what is *unique* in the living individual.

So far, Bergson's doctrine of intuition: we have now to test it.

Chapter XIV

INTUITIONISM EXAMINED

97. The question which intuitionism puts to us is plain: can we human beings have a direct perception of anything beyond what the senses show us: and if so, how much? Let us test the claim of the intuitionist in two cases: knowledge of the self, and knowledge of continuity.

Self-knowledge is perhaps the best case for intuition. For we certainly do not perceive our minds by the bodily senses. And yet it seems evident that we do perceive them. To Descartes the most certain of all knowledge is the knowledge "I exist": for if I try to doubt my existence, I must know that I doubt; and to doubt, I must exist. Knowledge of myself seems to be present with all knowledge of other objects. If I observe "the clock ticks," a completer statement of my experience would be "I hear the clock ticking": I am aware of the clock, but also aware of my hearing, and aware of myself as the being who hears.

But just this direct self-knowledge has been subject to searching question. Hume, seeking for a "self," cannot find it, but only a stream of impressions: and Kant so far corroborates his report as to say that the self, as the subject of knowl-

edge, can never be an object. If I say, "I perceive myself," I claim to be at once the observer and the object observed: but the self must be always the observer, and what is observed must be something else. The self, thinks Kant, is a logically necessary centre of reference for the various experiences of the same person: for he can always annex to those experiences the phrase "I think," "I hear," "I see," and the various grammatical subjects refer to the same Ego. But while the Ego thus infers the existence of the Ego (and here Hume was wrong), the Ego never catches sight of the Ego. Hume's difficulty was, as one critic remarked, the natural one of a man who goes out of his house, and looking in at the window, reports that he cannot find himself at home. It is not in the nature of the self to perceive itself.

These doubts have been elaborated in our own time by various thinkers, among them Charles Peirce and Josiah Royce. (The World and the Individual, II, pp. 253 ff.; The Problem of Christianity, vol. II, pp. 61 ff., 138 f.). Royce puts the case radically: "Never do I observe myself" (W. and I, ii, 265); "Common sense does not in the least know, when it appeals to the self, whom it is addressing." Royce bases his judgment on the perplexities of experience in trying to judge ourselves; in knowing the boundaries of our self,—where the self stops and the not-self begins; in knowing what kind we are,—for our friends often

know us better than ourselves, and we get our self estimates largely through reflection from their opinions of us; in knowing our own identity other than through external things such as places and duties. Royce believes that just as we reach a knowledge of other persons by interpreting the signs they give us, so we reach a knowledge of ourselves, reading a thousand signs that come to us, chiefly through social experience, showing what sort of person we are.

98. Just self-judgment is difficult; and few achieve it. But it is possible to be entirely sure that an object exists, and to be aware of it, without being able to describe accurately its qualities and limits. The uncertainties we suffer from in regard to ourselves are largely doubts about how we should be classed or measured with reference to others: do we rate as clever or stupid, as industrious or lazy, as reliable or shifty?—these are questions of comparison, of 'concepts,' the business of the intellect not of intuition. The fact that the intellect is in difficulties should not be held to discredit the immediate sense of our own being.

Those who doubt self-knowledge indirectly confirm it. Any one who asserts that the knower is different from the object known must know both of them in order to be sure of the distinction, and must therefore know the knower. Any one who says we may be mistaken in judging our own

quality must have some standard of judging the mistake. He is like some one who says a translation is in error; but that nobody knows the original: he refutes his own statement. Any one who asserts that the self is not the same from day to day and from company to company asserts that *it* grows and changes; and thereby confesses that he can identify it as the same self.*

We hold that the intuitionist is right, so far as the self is concerned: we have a direct knowledge of our own Ego—in spite of the miracle by which knower and known are the same—and this knowledge is the original by which all false judgments must be corrected. The last authority on one's own likes and dislikes, pleasures and pains, is *himself!*

99. We accept the positive doctrine of the intuitionist,—intuition exists: it gives us certain necessary knowledge (just how much it gives us beside self-knowledge we have still to enquire). But how is it with his negative doctrine,—the doctrine that the intellect cannot know these things? To test this let us take the case of *continuous change.*

Bergson holds that change, like time itself, is broken up by the intellect into discontinuous parts; and that these cannot be fused by the in-

* Bennett, C. A. Bergson's Doctrine of Intuition in Philosophical Review, January, 1916.

tellect into the original whole, which only intuition can give us. His favorite illustration is that of motion and the kinematograph. I think we may understand this best by enquiring how we know *continuity* in general, the kind of continuity that is illustrated by a continuous straight line or an unbroken surface as well as by an unremitting motion.

When we undertake to say what we mean by describing a line A——B as continuous, we are apt to speak in negatives: there are no gaps in it. To describe it positively, we may imagine a point moving from A to B: and then if we ask what we mean by saying that its motion is continuous, we return to the line and say that it covers in its journey all the points on the line. To the intellect, the continuity of the line is to be defined in terms of its points, of which there are an infinite number; and the question is, how shall we describe the setting of those points, each of which occupies a zero length of the line, so that together they will constitute the whole line.

Suppose that we fill the line in this way: set a point C midway between A and B; and then midway between each of the two new pairs, set another; and continue, according to the rule that midway between every pair of points there shall be one other point. This will evidently define an indefinite number of points; and the line might appear to be filled. But it is not.

To show this, take another line A′——B′ whose length is the diagonal of the square on AB; and for every point set between A and B, set a point on A′B′, in the same proportionate position. There will then be an infinitude of points on A′B′. Now if AB is superimposed on A′B′, with A on A′, *none of the other points on AB will touch any of the points on A′B′*. That is, we have found an infinitude of points not included in AB which already has an infinitude of points in it. And we could find other infinitudes by taking other lines whose ratio to the original line is some irrational number.

We must therefore try other modes of defining the series of points. Mathematicians have tried this; Dedekind and Cantor have found ways of defining series of points in such wise that there are no gaps in the line, no chance to cut it *between* the points. We need not follow these definitions (B. Russell, Introduction to Mathematical Philosophy, ch. x, gives a brief outline of the subject). But we have to ask the question, How does the mathematician know when he has succeeded? It can only be because he knows what he means by a continuum, namely, "all the points on the line." He must have a *concept* of continuity, quite as much as he has a concept of a point: it may even be that the concept of the continuum is the simpler of the two.

In the same way, if we attempt to analyze con-

tinuous motion, and discover that an infinite series of states of rest does not agree with what we mean, it can only be because we have a concept of continuous motion as a standard.

100. We conclude that the intellect cannot be excluded from the knowledge of change. Verbs and adverbs are 'concepts' in the same right as nouns and adjectives. 'Running' is the concept of a certain kind of motion; 'melting' of a certain kind of change: these are general ideas with many instances and varieties.

The concept is changeless in the sense that running must always mean running and not walking, creeping, flying . . . but it is not the less the concept of a change, and the permanence of the concept does not make our idea of change 'static' or inadequate to the living fact.

101. The intuitionist is mistaken in trying to define a region into which the intellect cannot come. For in defining that region, he makes a concept of it, and the intellect has already entered it.

After all, the intellect is not a separate organ of the mind. Both intuition and the intellect are the mind in action: intuition recognizing the presence of objects, intellect defining what they are. They are inseparable. They constitute a working-pair.

They might be distinguished as perception of

whole and perception of parts; perception of the object for itself and perception of its relations; perception of the unique in the object, and perception of the qualities it has in common with others. And since we are likely to forget the whole in attending to the parts, it is needful, from time to time, to be recalled to our intuitions.

But normally speaking, we do not forget the whole when we consider the parts; and therefore our analyses need not present us with dead objects which we cannot restore to life. A scientific knowledge of the world is not hostile to the growth of poetry; nor does a knowledge of anatomy detract from the painter's intuitive appreciation of the living body. The artist is the better, not the worse, for his science and his analyses. In every one, the art of living consists in keeping intuition and intellect together.

Chapter XV

ESTIMATE OF INTUITIONISM

102. The great achievement of intuitionism is that it restores our confidence in our power to know the real nature of the world we live in. It answers agnosticism.

Agnosticism and pragmatism agree in the assumption that behind the appearances there is some unknowable or inaccessible reality. Intuitionism holds that even if reality is in some sense 'behind' the appearances, as life may be said to be behind the manifestations of life, yet there is *nothing essentially concealed* from us by the 'relativity of knowledge': we may have direct perception of reality as it is, in 'sympathetic intelligence' or intuition.

103. This is evidently an immense claim,—a long stride from the cautious curbing of knowledge in Hume, Kant, Spencer and their like. Has intuition, then, any metaphysical results to its credit? Has it anything to report about the nature of reality?

Perception, of course, is an individual matter. And different individuals may perceive different

things about the world: the intuitions of different minds need not be identical. We cannot, therefore, say that intuition, as a way of knowing, carries with it any specific metaphysical doctrine, any more than pragmatism carries with it a specific doctrine.

But inasmuch as certain intuitionists, and Bergson in particular, have given a fairly full conceptual account of their results, we may take these results as illustrative of what the intuition of other observers may be able to verify.

104. Bergson has, in the first place, something to report about the *nature of life*.

It is the nature of life to 'endure,' that is, to carry its past along with it, to remember. (This is a peculiar use of the word endure; for it would not apply to rocks and atoms which we commonly think of as enduring, because they do not carry their past with them.) Life thus accumulates with time, like a snowball; and accordingly it meets every succeeding moment with a different self. On this account there can be (for a living being) no repetition of 'the same thing': the second appearance of the event is met with the memory of the first and is therefore something different. The second experience may be better (as when we hear a piece of music for the second time) or worse (as when the repetition of the drama, the plot being known, loses the element of suspense): in any case

it is something new. Life confers novelty on all its faces. The very laws of history cease to be true on being known. And the new meaning brings a new reaction, an experiment. Life is thus in its own nature *creative:* and evolution itself may be considered the result of an experimental vital impulse. (Creative Evolution, ch. i.)

105. It is implied in the above, as a second result, that life is *free*, not mechanically determined. The will is free. Likewise, everything that has life in it is free, in the sense that what it does from moment to moment is determined from within, by its own spontaneous and novel activity, and not from outside, by the necessity expressed in physical laws.

A mechanical law can apply only to repeatable events: when the cause happens, the effect follows,—when the temperature falls, water freezes, and the like. Then whatever in the nature of the case is unique, unlike anything that ever happened before, and unrepeatable, gives 'law' no foothold. Further, a law, "when the cause happens, the effect follows," requires that we can clearly distinguish cause and effect: the fall of the axe is one event, the splitting of the wood a subsequent and clearly different event. But in life, and particularly in mental life, there is no such clear separation of past and present: the past remains with the present, the so-called mental

'states' interpenetrate, and causality loses its meaning. (Time and Free Will, ch. iii.)

There are, of course, psychological 'laws' in the sense that there are some tendencies to regularity in the way our minds work. Much of this regularity is created by the mind itself, in the form of *habit*. Habit may be called an acquired mechanism. And evidently, if a mind becomes a 'slave of habit' it may fall a victim to the mechanisms it has itself created. But the purpose of habit is to get a mechanical way of responding to a mechanical situation, as in walking, the daily routine, and all technique; so that the mind is left free to deal with whatever is not mechanical in the world, in its own novel way. Thus life fights mechanical nature with mechanical weapons in the interest of greater freedom.

106. Finally, Bergson suggests that *reality in its whole extent is living*. We have been speaking as if the world were divided into two parts, the living and the mechanical; and as if these were distinct and somewhat hostile principles. This is 'dualism.' The naturalist reduces this dualism to a monism by deriving life from the physical. Bergson reduces it to a monism by the opposite route: he *derives the physical from life*. In so doing, he approaches the view of idealism which we shall shortly consider.

How can the physical world be derived from

life? We have seen that habit—which is mechanical—is derived from life. Imagine this process extended to the background of space, matter and natural law which habit assumes as existing (Creative Evolution, chapter iii). All free action requires a material to which it imparts form: the painter requires his canvas and colors, having their own reliable natures or 'habits'; the poet requires his words and his alphabet. It is impossible that the letters and words should assemble themselves by natural laws to make a poem, or that the colors and canvas should combine themselves into a picture. These products are created forms, products of freedom, like any act of the will. But once made, they leave a certain amount of new matter behind them, in the sense that the poet develops a new word, line, meter, or the painter a new method, which becomes a part of the material resource of his successors. By extending this rude analogy, it is possible to consider the entire material cosmos as a deposit of universal life, a record, so to speak, of growing intelligence.

In trying the difficult task of showing *how* the physical world is derived from life, Bergson is, of course, going beyond what intuition can give him, and entering the realm of intellectual explanation. All that intuition could give would be the simple dogma: Life is the reality behind matter; matter depends on life. The theory of how matter can be imagined to originate is, after all, less im-

portant than this intuition, which, if it is true, is the refutation of naturalism.

107. It appears, then, that intuition is or promises to be fertile in philosophical results: indeed, it may set up a good claim to be our most important mode of knowledge in every aspect of experience. For if everything that has life in it must be known by intuition; and if everything that exists has to be traced to life as its ultimate reality; then *nothing can be truly known until it is known intuitively.*

Let us set up a few propositions about the place of intuition in knowledge, supplementing our former conclusions. We recognized that intuition and intellect always go together. We must now recognize that they are mixed in very different proportions in different parts of our knowledge, and that intuition has a certain initiative of its own which is indispensable to good judgment.

(*a*) *Knowledge begins with intuition; and intuition is always ahead.*

We do not know living things, persons, by beginning (as empiricism suggests) with the parts and building up the whole: we perceive the whole from the beginning. Knowledge grows in detail; and the detail can be placed because the frame of the whole is there to place it.

It is true that many of our intuitions are *acquired.* We ought to distinguish between original

intuitions (as of time, self, etc.) and acquired intuitions (as of tricks of skill, connoisseurship, "knowing horses" and the like). The latter are of the nature of induction: they consist in *being admitted* to an inner knowledge of things after what Bergson calls a long acquaintance with their superficial manifestations. They are a winning of simplicity after much complexity. But these acquired intuitions are based on original intuitions, and could not exist without them.

Intuition is *always ahead* of intellect, in the sense that living things, persons, social situations, human causes and interests, are always inexhaustible. A person may be intuitively perceived, but is never completely known, analyzed, or described in conceptual terms. Mental tests, depending on analysis, always leave out something important. There is no chart of personality in which men can be classified and graded. Psychologies which depend on analyzing the mind can give us true knowledge, but never complete knowledge; and perhaps the most important knowledge is that which eludes scientific treatment. In business, the gift of intuition is an indispensable element of foresight. In the movement of history, the prophet, the artist, the poet,—that is, the true ones,—see farther ahead than the plotters of historical curves. Philosophy is expressed in poetry and dogma long before it can be expressed in rational systems.

(*b*) *Intuition is always in danger of getting lost.*

This is a simple corollary of the general rule that attention to the parts tends to obscure the whole. Details of law may blind the skilled jurist to the intuition of human justice. And this may be so prevalent an occupational defect that the common citizen may come to dread the courts of law, as places in which justice only occasionally emerges, as it were, by accident from beneath the mass of technicalities. The scholar may be buried in the meticulous, through zeal for his subject; and spend his life in adding one more to the list of Latin subjunctives, which the young Roman absorbed in the run of conversation. A friendship founded on intuitive perception or liking, a true intuition, may have to undergo a stage of criticism,—the mutual criticism of personal defects which intelligent acquaintance reveals: and a legal attitude to these defects may easily obscure the intuition and destroy the friendship. Every day's work, by sharpening attention to detail, lowers the level of intuition, until fatigue brings with it a certain mechanical rigidity of outlook.

In all such cases, there must be some way of recovering intuition, gaining fresh views of the whole: and this usually occurs in the normal rhythm of living, the alternation of work and play, of waking and sleeping, of the secular life and the life of worship (which is deliberate atten-

tion to affairs in their wholeness), of science and philosophy. These swings back to wholeness of view must be resorted to whenever it appears that more effort of the same kind does no good, but more litigation, more analysis, more distinctions, only sink us deeper in our defective apprehension.

(*c*) But as intuition is helpless without intellect, it must always be *accompanied and followed by conceptual thinking.*

Intuition, if it tries to set up alone as a sufficient way of knowing, has three defects. It cannot define *what* it perceives; for a definition makes use of a concept. It cannot *communicate* what it perceives; for language is made of the common coin of concepts. It cannot *defend its truth, nor distinguish true from false interpretation,* without the aid and criticism of the intellect.

There is always in the living facts of experience a unique quality which concepts (depending as they do on likenesses and other relationships) never do justice to, which only intuition grasps, and which—at any moment—cannot be communicated. But there is nothing which in its nature *excludes the effort* to define, analyze, communicate: there is nothing so unique that it has not in it the universal quality which makes it susceptible to conception, to thought.

The truth of intuitionism is thus no charter for laxity of thinking, or reliance on uncontrolled inspiration. Genius does not consist solely in the

capacity for profound intuition: it consists in the capacity to express, i. e., to push the grasp of conceptual thought a stage farther into the elusive substance of life. Intuition is not wisdom; and intellect is not wisdom: wisdom is the union of intuition and intellect.

We said that wherever there is feeling, there is intuition. We now add,

Wherever there is intuition, there must be thought. We turn once more to types of metaphysics which are based at once on intuition and reason.

PART III

TYPES OF METAPHYSICS AND EPISTEMOLOGY

TYPE IV

DUALISM

DUALISM

References for reading

Plato. Phædrus.
Balfour, A. Science, Religion and Reality (edited by Jos. Needham), Introduction.
Needham, Jos. Mechanistic Biology (in Science, Religion and Reality).

Literature of Dualism

Anaxagoras. Burnet, J. Early Greek Philosophy, 272–300. Gomperz, T. Greek Thinkers, Bk. II, ch. iv.
Plato. Phædo; Phædrus; Timæus.
Descartes. Passions of the Soul, arts. xxx–xxxiv; On Man.
Pratt, J. B. Matter and Spirit.
McDougall, W. Body and Mind.
Driesch, Hans. Science and Philosophy of the Organism; The Problem of Individuality.
Bergson, H. Mind-Energy; Matter and Memory; Creative Evolution, chs. 1, 2.

Critique of Dualism

Plato. Symposium.
Augustine. Confessions, Book vii.
Descartes. Principles of Philosophy, §§ 45–70.
Spinoza. Ethics, Book I.
Hocking. The Self, Its Body and Freedom.
Moore, Jared S. Rifts in the Universe.
Bergson, H. Creative Evolution, ch. 3.

Chapter XVI

DUALISM

108. *The quest of unity.* Bergson has presented Reason in the rôle of an analyst, while intuition grasps wholeness or unity. What are we to make, then, of the often repeated statement that reason "seeks unity"? Is it possible that reason *does both?*

Consider reason at work in classifying things, one of the first stages in getting scientific command of the world. We put together things that are alike; and call them by the same name. Presumably this is "seeking unity"? We bring cattle, deer, camels, sheep, goats, antelopes and various other animal groups together under the class-name ruminant: one idea comprehends them all. But what is the ground of this grouping? Some single trait common to all these animals. They all have complex stomachs and chew the cud. This observation sounds like the result of analysis. Must we analyze *in order to unify?*

Or consider reason at work in explaining events. Explaining is in some respects like classing; we bring many events under the same formula. Thus the release of energy in the body is explained as being the same sort of event as the

burning of fuel; they are both forms of oxidation. Oxidation in turn is one of many forms of the flow of energy whose laws in various fields may presumably be brought under a single law, the vastest generalization of science. In terms of this single law, all particular physical happenings would be explained. This is surely "seeking unity." But in order to bring, let us say, the laws of heat and the laws of motion together, it is necessary to conceive heat as the motion of molecules. We are driven to smaller and smaller units in order to conceive all happenings as *their* behavior. We must analyze in order to unite. Reason does both; it is no mere analyst for the sake of analyzing: it certainly seeks unity. Its goal would be attained if some one law could be found which would explain all events; and some one substance could be found of which all things are various forms. Or rather, its goal would require that the substance and the law were themselves united in a single ultimate reality.

109. But is there any guarantee that the world is such as to satisfy this aspiration of reason? Perhaps there is no one reality which explains everything. After our best efforts, is not the world a grouping of several distinct kinds of thing?

The strict materialist would say: everything is *matter*. But does he not require, in addition, the *space* in which his matter exists, the *motion* it has,

and the *time* through which this motion takes place? Herbert Spencer, as we have noticed, used five "ultimate scientific ideas,"—space, time, matter, motion, force,—and adds consciousness as an awkward something else. He speculated that all of these may be manifestations of one reality, whose best name is force, energy, power; but how this one reality accounts for space and time and consciousness remains obscure. Spencer aspires to a monism, but he only achieves a pluralism with a faint hope of unity in the unknown!

To many minds—and some of them among the greatest—our best efforts to understand things rationally arrive not at one reality, but at a pair of contrasting realities, such as mind and matter, —not at a monism, but at a dualism.

110. Perhaps the oldest of all extant traditions, that which lies behind the great philosophies of China, thinks of the world in this way. Experience is a struggle between opposing principles, light against darkness, heat against cold, dry against wet, good against evil: of these several pairs, the beneficent elements, these remote thinkers believed, were united in one principle, the Yang; the maleficent elements were united in one principle, the Yin. It appears ungracious but it is also a fact of history that the Yang and the Yin were further contrasted as masculine and feminine. And these two principles, mingled in different propor-

tions in every existent thing, explain not alone the forms which things assume but also the endless strife and inner conflict of the world.

In the ancient religion of Persia as reformed by Zarathustra this conflict takes on cosmic proportions. The universe is the scene of war between Ahriman, deity of evil and of darkness, and Ahura Mazda (Ormuzd), deity of goodness and light, worshipped under the symbol of fire. The earth, created by the joint action of both, is a mixed realm; man is called upon to take sides in this cosmic struggle, the righteous coming to the aid of Ahura Mazda. In fact, this warfare is carried on chiefly within the wills of men, and their free choices of good and evil incline the scales now one way and now another. Most ancient religions had their spirits of evil; but the Persian religion most clearly unified all evil and all good in these two figures, divided all the rest of reality between them, and hung the history of the universe on a moral issue. The Persian Ahriman became the prototype of the Jewish Satan and of the Christian Devil.

111. It was the Greek genius which was first able to look at the world with a clear intellectual interest, in which ethical and religious motives though not absent were not dominating. Their great thinkers were metaphysicians of a pure stock; and when, in Plato, they came to a definite

dualism, it was a division of the world not between the good and the evil, but between the material and the immaterial.

They had begun by being naïve materialists—monists of a sort: "All things are water," said Thales; "All things are air, or fire," said others. Matter is at first so obvious, the mind so intangible and out-of-the-foreground, that mind had to be *discovered* for metaphysics, as a part of reality omitted by these theories of the first look. The honor of this discovery must be shared between Heracleitus (540–475 B. C.) and Anaxagoras (500–428 B. C.); Heracleitus teaching that there is a principle of universal Reason (*logos*) which like an infinitely subtle flame pervades all the processes of the eternal Flux; while Anaxagoras believed in a cosmic Mind as an abiding principle of order (*nous*) instigating the evolution of the world from chaos, sorting out the well-mixed germs of things, bringing objects and living beings into distinctness from each other and into classes or species. Though Anaxagoras still imagined the Mind a very fine and diaphanous substance disseminated throughout limitless space, he came close to realizing its distinction from all physical objects, and thus stood on the verge of dualism.

Plato (427–347 B. C.) sees the world as a system of immaterial beings, the "ideas," which appear to be "embodied" in the particular shapes

we see by becoming as it were entrapped in matter, and compromised by association therewith, but which in reality remain unsullied in their own unchangeable realm. The ideas are perfect and eternal; their visible images are defective and passing. There is a type tiger; actual tigers are more or less good specimens of this type; the ideal specimen does not exist. Nevertheless, the ideal, the type or prototype of all actual tigers, is the *real* tiger. It is what our knowledge, when it is true, seizes as the essence of all members of that class at all times, the unchanging pattern of the species. It is the business of thought to discern these ideas, in the midst of their defective images of sense; and especially the most general ideas, as of Being, of Virtue, of Beauty, of the Good. The material principle in man, present in his consciousness as sensation and sense-desire, tends to obscure his perception of the ideas; thought is most perfect when the disturbing avenues of sensation are shut off; the soul is enmeshed in the body as in a prison, and may attain a purer vision of the ideas after death,—as it presumably had before birth, since the new discernment of an idea in life is attended with strange tingling as of reminiscence. So Plato separates the immaterial ideas which are real and eternal, from the material substance which is a sort of eternal non-being to which experience owes its defective and transitory forms. Plato's dualism puts the ideal over against

the material, the universal over against the particular, the perfect over against the imperfect, the absolute over against the relative; and the aspiring spirit must strain toward the immaterial Good against the leashes of the body.*

Wherever dualism has recurred in the history of thought it has been due to some new perception of the unique quality of the mind. Thus Descartes felt bound to separate this self of his, this I-think of which he was so unshakably certain, from the physical world; mental substance is that which thinks, *res cogitans;* physical substance is *res extensa.* And Kant, with an even intenser perception of mentality, regarding Descartes's field of extension as a property or function of the mind itself, still believed that there was an unknowable reality outside the mind at whose incentive the materials of sensation appear to us.

112. The great dualistic systems of history have thus dichotomized the world *in different places;* but they have all insisted on the reality and independence of some mental or spiritual being. If we were to classify the great thinkers as the great disturbers of thought and the great finishers or settlers of thought, we may say that the great disturbers of thought have frequently been dualists. Plato, Descartes and Kant were great disturbers; their greatness consisted very largely

* Read the great myth in the Phædrus depicting this struggle.

in the fact that they stimulated a series of equally great efforts to resolve the antitheses which they made evident. Bergson also is to be numbered among the disturbers: he has again seized with intense vigor the uniqueness of Life as over against Mechanism; his dualism has challenged the complacencies of a satisfied evolutionary naturalism. We have now to consider dualism on its merits.

Chapter XVII

DUALISM EXAMINED

113. Ancient dualism was chiefly occupied with a rift in the cosmos, of which the dual nature of man is a sort of echo; modern dualism is chiefly concerned with the mind-and-body problem, and interprets the cosmos in the light of that domestic division. We shall begin by examining the relations of mind and body.

114. Agreeing that we know what we mean by mind and by body, and agreeing with our savage ancestors that these words mean different things, so that our imagination may even conceive the mind or soul as a temporary guest in the body, how is this intimate union possible? A union so close that when I act,—let us say, take a walk,—it never occurs to me to go without my body, never occurs to me that there is any other self to go walking than the entire "person,"—the mind-body partnership!

If mind and body are two different realities, what theories can we form of this association?

There are two, technically called the theories of *parallelism* and *interactionism*. Both of them invite us to think of mind and body as two *processes*

rather than as two substances: they ask What have these events which make up our mental history to do with these other events which make up the history of the brain? Parallelism asserts that (certain) brain-events and mind-events run along in perfect correspondence each to each, without interference from either side. Interactionism holds that brain-events affect mind-events, and that mind-events affect brain-events. Inasmuch as these two series either do or do not affect each other, there are for dualism no other alternatives.

115. *Parallelism.* Both theories are interested in the position of the imaginary physiologist who is supposed to be investigating brain-events while the living person is carrying on his train of ideas. He is armed with every conceivable instrument of physical and chemical knowledge, capable of minutest measurements. It is agreed that he cannot see the thoughts. The question is whether he can see anything which will betray the existence of this unique union of thought and brain. Will the brain use some of its energy in producing thought or emotion?—in which case, some physical energy will appear to vanish! Or will the mind, in deciding to move a muscle, impart some impulse to a brain-event which the previous brain-events do not account for?—in which case physical energy will appear to be created! The traditional methods of the physiologist would be distinctly upset if he

were obliged to make such allowances as these; and while he would probably not "abandon science," as some have feared, there is no doubt that his prejudices (for scientific workers sometimes have them) protest against such a situation as undesirable, and perhaps inconceivable.

Parallelism gives this imaginary physiologist his own way. There is nothing in the brain-events constituting any exception to the laws of physical nature; no passing back and forth of energy from the physical to the mental realm. The brain behaves precisely as the naturalist would expect. But the brain is not the mind. The mind follows its own laws with equal cleanness. It knows nothing of the physiologist nor of the brain; its world is coherent on the basis of its own principles of connection, namely, the principles of *meaning*. And since we have two perfectly consistent series of events, they may form an harmonious union.

116. This theory would be more plausible if it were not dualistic. If we have two independent realities, mind and body, each going its own way, the perfect attunement which this theory requires becomes the extremest improbability. It is only believable if we can consider the mind and the body as two different aspects of the same thing, so that we have really but one series of events which appear to the inner observer as the events of his mind, and to the outer observer, the physi-

ologist, as the events of a brain. We are then not dualists, but monists: and Spinoza, the first great parallelist, was such a monist, holding that thought and extension are but two ways in which we apprehend the underlying substance of the world.

But again, if our parallelism is dualistic it is necessarily *deterministic;* for at least the physical side of the event is following the demands of the physical order in its separation from the mental; and if the physical finger in obedience to physical law pulls a physical trigger, it is not evident how the mental event corresponding to this can be other than a will to shoot!

Now if the mind really makes no difference to the series of physical events by its presence, it is not quite clear why (on Darwinian principles) the mind should exist. Or if the mind can go on through the same set of experiences whether the body is there or not, why is not the physical world superfluous? How has creation come to duplicate its history in these alternate versions? Parallelism hardly fits the credibilities of the situation.

117. *The theory of interaction* has the great initial advantage of accepting what appear to be the obvious facts of experience, namely, that the body affects the mind and the mind affects the body. It restores to the mind that sense of usefulness of which parallelism robbed it; the conscious

intelligence of the human mind has some value in the struggle for existence; our thinking does something which the physiology of the brain could not accomplish. It would perhaps be worth while to be conscious, even though our physical machinery did all the work, merely for the sake of enjoying the panorama of existence. But this version of our mental life is strangely out of accord with our belief that we are agents, not spectators only; that our wills can make changes in the world, including the world of nature; that when I dig a ditch, my mind is using my muscles to alter the physical facts of the universe.

118. Now what is it, precisely, that the mind does which the body with its nerves and brain could not do? It is the neo-vitalists, holding to a distinct vital principle, who have given the most definite answer to this question. (A vitalist is necessarily a dualist and an interactionist. For he comes by his vitalism through discovering that there is something in the behavior of living organisms which the resources of mechanics and chemistry cannot explain.)

We ordinarily have no difficulty in distinguishing a living body from a machine. The living body operates itself, whereas the machine is operated; the living body is flexible and various in its movements, the machine follows a limited series of motions; the living body *moves to a purpose,*

so that we who look on can 'understand' what it is up to, whereas the machine moves to the purpose of some controller, not to its own. When I step on a log and find it to be an alligator, the change in my judgment is due to a kind of motion in the alligator which logs do not present, a flexible motion which appears to come from within and to aim at self-preservation, possibly continuing that aim through a variety of postures. As William James put the matter, the outer signs of mental life are "the pursuit of ends with the choice of means." An engine may appear to pursue an end; but if balked by an obstacle, it does not devise some other way around. The utility of the mind lies in its *inventiveness*, after adopting the welfare of the body as a part of its purpose.

Further, the mind is persistent, and can continue to do its work after interruption, and in various orders. A machine must grind out its songs always in the same way; or if, perchance, it can say its alphabet backward, it cannot mix up the order of its letters. A spider whose web is partly destroyed can begin anywhere and mend it; a bird whose nest-building is interrupted may start again, and finish it in any one of several different orders. Mind is of use by *keeping the end in view*, and fitting the action, through all sorts of new and unexpected situations, to that end.

Perhaps the word *guidance* will express what, in all these cases, the mind contributes to the ma-

chine. When Hans Driesch finds that he can cut a star-fish embryo into pieces in every direction at random, and that these pieces, if not too minute, will develop into complete adults, he infers that the growth is *guided* by some vital principle. When Bergson finds that the molluscs in the order of evolution proceed by steady steps to develop an eye, which astonishingly resembles the eye developed by the independent line of vertebrates, he infers that these two series have been *guided* by a common vital impetus to this useful end. When McDougall considers the 'instinct' by which pigeons or bees find their way home, under changing conditions of appearance and lighting and odor, he infers that their behavior is *guided*, not by any 'stimuli' acting on nerve-machines, but by a mind which has an 'idea' of location and a 'purpose' to get home.

119. Another point at which mechanical explanations seem to fail is in that kind of behavior which responds, not to what things are, but to what they mean. A child can be made to cry by a spanking: the response to that stimulus may very well be as mechanical as the stimulus. But if the cry is caused by a reproof or threat or sign of dislike or fancy of neglect, the mechanical explanation is in difficulties: a machine can respond to a sensation, but how can it respond to an idea or *meaning?*

An instinct is a mechanism which is to be set

off by the appropriate stimulus; and in a good machine the same stimulus would naturally produce always the same response. Now consider the instinct of curiosity; what will stimulate that instinct? Anything strange, let us say. But what is strange to-day is not strange to-morrow. The same stimulus does not produce the same effect. Curiosity, then, is not a mechanism: it is aroused not by what objects are but by what they mean to the observer. This sort of response to meaning, the vitalist urges, requires a mind.*

Thus the vitalist answers the question, What do the mind and the body do to each other, as follows: The body, through sensation, presents the mind with a report of the facts of its situation; the mind, acting on the motor regions of the brain, substitutes an intelligent reaction for the mechanical reaction which would otherwise have taken place,—an intelligent reaction being one which grasps the meaning of the facts, as well as the bare facts themselves, and which is inventive and persistent in guiding the organism to a desirable end. *Ideas* are inserted into the reflex arc.

120. If now we ask our dualist to come a little closer to the actual events, and explain where and how body acts on mind and mind on body, he may

* For more detailed discussion of these points, see my article, "The Dilemma in the Conception of Instinct," Journal of Abnormal Psychology and Social Psychology, June-Sept., 1921 reprinted as Appendix I in Human Nature and its Remaking.

acknowledge that this question is hard to answer. The physiologist's perplexity we have noted. Our own perplexity is hardly less; for we do not discover our sensations coming in from the body,—they are simply there; and we do not discover our volitions acting on the brain,—we are sublimely unaware of the existence of that organ by any direct experience. The dualist may say that it is not necessary to explain how these mutual effects take place, so long as it is evident that they do take place.

But do they take place? We do not observe their taking place. And is it possible or conceivable that mind and body should affect each other? If so, it is a case of anomalous causation. Everywhere else in the world, cause and effect are alike in kind and equal in quantity; but how can a volition be equal in quantity to an energy-change in the cortex? As Clifford put it, we might as well expect "a goods train to be held together by the sentiment of amity between the stoker and the guard." This difficulty, so formidable as to drive many thinkers back to parallelism, has required the more responsible dualists to offer some theory of the process of interaction.

121. Descartes's attempt is famous. He lighted upon a mysterious and minute glandular body in the midst of the brain, the pineal body, as the place where the thoughts may meet the vital spir-

its and, because of a great delicacy of physical poise in that organ, deflect their course by an infinitesimal impulse. This speculation was regarded as signally unfortunate even in his own day, though no one could then have suspected that the "pineal gland" is a degenerate middle eye, clearly marked in certain reptiles!

Recent theories have been more ingenious and discreet. That of Driesch is most carefully worked out.* Mindful of the principle of the conservation of energy, he inserts between the mind and the body an intermediate, non-mechanical principle, purposive in its nature (which he calls, after Aristotle, *entelechy*) having the capacity to *delay* incipient changes in the brain, and so without changing their amount to alter their outcome.

All such attempts indicate the good faith of the vitalist; and yet are sure to suffer from excess of ingenuity. There appears to be no valid reason for sparing the conservation of energy; for if the mind is to change the course of nature in any way, it must do some work which would otherwise be done by a physical force. Hence various dualists boldly reject the physical law of conservation in this case, and regard the mind as a source of energy.† And some of them point out that the causal principle itself has no sanctity other than

* Science and Philosophy of the Organism.

† McDougall, Body and Mind: Bergson, Mind-Energy; Pratt, Matter and Spirit, p. 152.

as a description of what sort of events we find actually tied together in the order of nature. Any sort of thing, for aught we know, may be the cause of any other sort of thing; and we cannot dismiss *a priori* the possibility that mind may act on matter, and *vice versa*, merely because elsewhere in nature there is likeness of kind between cause and effect.

122. The real difficulty with interactionism, however, does not lie in the circumstance that some physical laws would be interfered with. It lies in the fact that it is—while seeming to be in accord with experience—radically *out of accord with experience.* Neither the body nor the mind can accept the rôle which it assigns to them.

The mind is called upon to do only what cannot be explained by physiological machinery; and inasmuch as physiology explains almost everything, that leaves the mind very little to do. I am pursued by a wild beast in the forest; the instinct of fear takes possession of my bodily mechanism and I find my body running away—with my full consent; whereas I, the mind, as guide in the affair have nothing to do but dodge the trees! This is not the way I should describe my experience; I never consciously make this division of labor between mind and body; I, the mind, do not consider myself as doing a *part* of the operation; if it is a conscious operation at all, I do all of it:

What my body, as a whole, does, *I do.*

It is I who perform all of my voluntary acts, however the mechanism of instinct or other bodily processes may take part in them. From the standpoint of experience, then, the body is not something else than the mind: it is an organ of the mind, and so far, a part of the mind itself.*

(Ponder this idea: it may rectify some mistaken notions about what you mean by 'the mind.' The intuition of self, as we said, is a bit of pure certainty; but it is not infallible about how far the self extends.)

123. But the body also has reason to protest the place assigned to it by dualism. For as set apart from the mind, it suffers by the contrast. Its work is of a lower order; it is "merely" mechanical. There would then be some justification for Plato's assumption that knowledge proceeds better when the body is shut-off; and for the moral dualism which has frequently gone with the metaphysical dualism, according to which the body, in the form of sense-pleasure and desire, is to be overcome.

Now there is nothing greater or truer in the whole field of ethics than the demand that "the world, the flesh, and the devil" are to be overcome: there is a moral *direction*, and it pulls away from

* For an elaboration of this argument, read The Self, Its Body, and Freedom.

that sensuality and moral materialism to which the easy will perpetually gravitates. No one has grasped this moral direction more nobly than Plato. But what we have to fight against is materiality of the "mere" variety. It is when the body sets up as moral authority, and demands that *its* needs, *its* instincts, *its* complexes and libidos, shall be attended to as separate and sufficient goods that we have to rebuke its presumptions in the name of something higher and more complete, our moral direction. That higher thing cannot be a life of the mind in defiance of or apart from the body. It is a life of the mind which appropriates and absorbs the body into its own currents of meaning,—makes it mean what *I* mean, instead of taking my cue from it. It is not the ascetic rejection, but the "sublimation" of sense-pleasure: it is what Plato with his immortal sanity and profound psychological insight described in the Symposium. The Symposium is the completion of the Phædrus, and the answer in advance to an excessive mediæval *contemptus mundi.** Our materialisms are frequently the revenge of an unduly despised physical existence.†

124. If dualism will not work in the mind-body

* Read Paulsen's memorable chapter on Christianity in his Ethics, Book I, chapter ii.

† This remark does not apply to much of the materiality of to-day. The vogue of psycho-analysis, for example, is largely the welcome always accorded to the quack who can assure sensualists on scientific grounds that it is unhealthy for them not to do about as they please.

relation, we are committed to some kind of monism,—the human person must be one reality. What are the alternatives?

Naturalistic monism would say that this reality is the physical organism: mind is a sort of luminous (and ineffective) accompaniment—an 'epiphenomenon'—of the real process, the life of the body. That view we have rejected.

It may be that mind and body are both appearances of some third reality, which is neither: that they work together as 'parallel' phenomena because they are two aspects of this underlying neutral substance. This as we have seen is Spinoza's view.

Or it may be that the mind itself is the one reality; and that the body acts with it (from each person's own point of view) as a part of it, and (from the point of view of other selves) as a visible image or expression of that whole person. This is the view of idealism, which we shall shortly consider.

Chapter XVIII

COSMIC DUALISM

125. It becomes evident why the great dualists are disturbers of thought. They have recognized a real distinction in the world; and they have made so much of it as to leave us with a set of unsolved problems,—How can these unlike and independent beings co-operate? and How, if really independent, have they found themselves together in the first place?

These questions are somewhat more embarrassing for the mind-and-body dualism than for the cosmic dualism, which begins by recognizing the universe at large as a scene of the mixture or conflict of two contrasting principles. For mind and the body are so inseparably fused in the human personality that Aristotle could fairly reply to Plato: the soul is not something else than the body, it is the very "form" of the body, the inner life of the body, fitting it as the hand the glove. In the macrocosmos, contrast or even hostility of opposites can more fairly represent the whole situation. Yet here also dualism must explain the relation between the opposing beings; and answer whether they are really independent of each other in origin and substance.

126. In considering these cosmic dualisms, it may appear slightly ominous at the outset that they have divided the world in different places, one healing over what another had breached. The moral dualisms of good and evil are to some extent effaced by the metaphysical dualisms of idea and matter, or form and stuff. Yet never entirely effaced,—the metaphysical cleavage becomes a source of moral direction, as in Plato, and, we think, in Bergson. Let us consider them on their merits.

127. There is an evident reason why religious feeling, if it has a strong ethical quality, should tend to dualism. For dualism relieves the divine principle of the responsibility of having created the evil principle which it is engaged in fighting.

But when God is so divested of responsibility he becomes a finite and limited being; and his significance as creator is lost, for there is something else in the world which can exist by its own right as well as he. In such a view, the Good is simply not the supreme being—there is no supreme being; and the mind seeks some more ultimate reality which may account for the existence and mutual contact of both.

Hence religious dualisms have seldom been either enduring or consistent. One is likely to find in the background a belief in some mysterious ultimate unity. In the Chinese tradition, Tao, the un-

known Law, is above the Yang and the Yin. In Persia, the two deities are the twin sons of Time, Zervana Akarana, and are destined at last to be absorbed into Time again.

128. On purely logical grounds, it is evident that the opposite members of a contrast, such as light and dark, cold and heat, have a strong family-likeness. Cold and heat are both degrees of temperature; they are contrasted only with reference to our sensibility and to each other. Can the same be said of good and evil, or of spirit and matter?

Of the evil, one may certainly say that it must contain good in order to be effective as evil. Lucifer can fight Heaven only because he is also of angelic fibre. If we could effect a clean cut separation of good from evil, evil would vanish; and the question has been raised whether good would not vanish also, i. e., whether some element of contrast is not necessary to give good its quality. Of that we shall have more to say; but at least so much is clear,—because of the meaninglessness of pure evil, good and evil cannot be independent realities.

129. Of spirit and matter, it is not so evident that either requires the other in order to exist. They appeared to Descartes to be two distinct substances: for "two substances are said to be distinguished really when each can exist of itself

apart from the other."* We can form a clear and distinct idea of space and of matter without thinking of mind: this was sufficient to convince Descartes that matter could exist without mind. It seemed to him also that we could form a clear and distinct idea of "I think" without contemplating space or matter; and therefore that mind could exist without a physical world. What is your own judgment of this?

130. Most of us, I suspect, believe that we can think of matter without thinking of mind at all: we can imagine a time when the world in its lonely evolution had no vestige of consciousness in it; we can think of space empty of things, and empty of persons who think about it. When Professor Whitehead said, in his book on the Concept of Nature, that "nature is closed to mind," he meant just that,—that we can and do consider the facts of physics without dragging the mind into the picture. And this constitutes a pretty fair argument—at least for those who believe with Descartes that our thought is a good criterion of reality—that the stuff of nature is an independent reality.

On the other hand, most of us would say that there is some difficulty in thinking of mind without matter. When we think, we think *of* something; and that something always (or nearly al-

* Spinoza, Principles of Descartes's Philosophy, Part I, Def. X.

ways?) has sense-imagery in it. Nature is an indispensable raw-material for experience, which is the basis of all thinking. Then mind needs matter in order to exist?

But consider more carefully. Does mind need matter, or does it need *simply the thought of matter?* And could this thought exist without the real existence of the matter as an independent substance? If you see the point of these questions you have the key to the movement of philosophy from Descartes onward.

131. Spinoza said: it is evident that mind and matter belong together,—our thoughts are first of all thoughts about matter; but when we think of matter, we think of it as an appearance or 'attribute' of the ultimate reality itself,—and this thought is true. Likewise when we think of the mind; that also appears to us as the very essence of reality,—and this appearance is likewise true. But if both are true, there can be but one ultimate reality or substance, of which matter and mind (extension and thought) are two quite complete and equivalent modes of expression as it were in different languages. We must return from dualism to monism: and this one ultimate substance, we may call Nature or God,—one being, perfect, self-caused, and the ground of everything that appears in experience.

Leibniz hazarded a bolder suggestion: perhaps

the *thought* of matter is sufficient, without the real existence of any corresponding outer substance. The thought of nature is, after all, just what we have. When we say that the mind needs nature as raw material for thinking, perhaps we have told the truth and the whole truth about what nature is. This leads the way to another sort of monism, in which the reality of nature is absorbed in the reality of the mind. This is called idealism.

Idealism appears historically as the type of philosophy to which dualism has naturally led the course of thought. For as dualism has arisen each time because of an exceptionally vivid intuition of what the mind is, the meaning of that intuition cannot be realized by resigning the mind once more to inclusion within nature,—one of its own objects; but rather by achieving a new and revolutionary monism in which the mind takes nature into itself.

Naturalistic monism we have judged on its merits, and have found it unsatisfactory. There are then only two alternatives. Either a monism like Spinoza's which would absorb both mind and matter into a single substance whose ultimate being is not so much neutral as unknowable. Or else the precise counterpart of naturalism,—a monism which would absorb nature somehow into mind. How can that be? We must turn to the idealistic world-view for an answer.

132. Meanwhile, a remark on the inferences from history. It is historically true that every dualism has given way to a monism which has brought together what dualism had put asunder. The later dualism of Kant was immediately displaced by the monism of Fichte and his successors. This circumstance does not of itself refute the dualist. For it may be said with equal truth that after every synthesis of the cosmic opposition, the fundamental struggle and restlessness of the world have led some new thinker to hazard another form of duality in metaphysics. No monism can be finally satisfactory which does not account for the drag and resistance which the spiritual principle of the world encounters both in its effort to know the world and in its moral *élan.*

TYPE V

IDEALISM

IDEALISM

References for reading

Berkeley, G. Of the Principles of Human Knowledge (Open Court edition, omitting sections 118–134; or Rand, 263–306).
and also one of the following:

(Metaphysical aspect of idealism)

Plato. Phædo. (Everyman's, No. 456.)
Fichte. Vocation of Man (Rand, 516–534).
Royce, J. Reality and Idealism, Spirit of Modern Philosophy, Lecture xi. (Rand, 800–832.)

(Ethical aspect of idealism)

Epictetus. Discourses, Book I and Encheiridion, tr. G. Long.
Royce, J. Philosophy of Loyalty (omitting V and VI).
Jones, Sir Henry. Idealism as a Practical Creed.
Kant. Foundations of the Metaphysics of Morals, transl. by T. K. Abbott.

(Idealism and Fine Art)

Hegel, G. W. F. Philosophy of Fine Art, tr. B. Bosanquet.

(Idealism and the interpretation of History)

Hegel. Philosophy of History, Introduction. Tr. Sibree.

(Idealism and Religion)

Royce, J. Religious Aspect of Philosophy.
Hocking. Meaning of God, ch. 17–20.

Literature of Idealism

Works of Leibniz, Berkeley, Kant (in part), Fichte, Schelling, Schopenhauer, Hegel, Lotze, Carlyle, Emerson, T. H. Green, F. H. Bradley, Josiah Royce, Croce, Gentile, Bosanquet, Hoernle, Howison, M. Sinclair, and others. See Perry, Philosophy of the Recent Past, Part III; A. K. Rogers, English and American Philosophy, chs. V and VI.

Critique of Idealism

Hoernle, R. F. A. Idealism as a Philosophy (the best summary appreciation).
Royce, J. Lectures on Modern Idealism.

See literature under realism and mysticism, below; esp.

Sheldon, W. H. Strife of Systems.
Perry R. B. Present Philosophical Tendencies, Part III.
Santayana, G. Winds of Doctrine.
Höffding, H. Modern Philosophers.
Montague, W. P. Ways of Knowing.

Chapter XIX

WHAT IDEALISM IS

133. Idealism is the philosophy which holds that reality is of the nature of mind.

It is not, like pragmatism and intuitionism, primarily a way of knowing, with incidental metaphysical results. It is primarily a metaphysics, a world-view which may be reached by various ways of knowing. Thus pragmatism and intuitionism have commonly led their adherents to idealism, or in the direction of idealism.

Bergson, in so far as he foreshadows a monistic world-view, tends, as we saw, toward idealism. But he stops in an interesting intermediate position. If we should set up a scale of being,

Matter-energy . . . Life . . . Mind,

naturalism interprets the whole scale by the first term, idealism interprets the whole scale by the last term, while Bergson tries to interpret both ends by the middle term. His doctrine might be termed bio-ism. The idealist would comment that Bergson, in order to make his interpretation intelligible, is obliged to credit "life" with the qualities of mind, such as memory and inventiveness. The idealist believes that our alternatives are

really but two: *we must either explain mind by physical nature, or we must explain physical nature by mind.* And since we have found the former to be impossible (Chapter VI), we must adopt the latter. (See Fichte, First Introduction, in Rand, p. 489.)

134. The idealist's position may be expressed in two propositions, one negative and one positive:

(*a*) *The apparent self-sufficiency of nature is illusory:* nature appears to be independent, to go its own course, to operate its own laws, to be eternal, to require no creator or other ground outside of itself; but in truth, nature does depend on something else. (Note that idealism does not say that "nature is illusory," as it is sometimes supposed to say.)

(*b*) *That upon which nature depends is Mind* (Spirit, Idea). The word, idealism, is not particularly fortunate to express what this positive proposition means. In the first place it ought not to suggest ideals (as though it had any monopoly of ideals) but *ideas*, the 'l' having entered the word for euphony rather than for sense: idea-ism would be more to the point. In the second place, the stem 'idea' is an historical accident, due to the fact that John Locke and his idealistic successor, Berkeley, regarded experience as made up of *ideas*, which are, at best, fragments of mentality. Mentalism or spiritualism would be more accurate

names, but they have been drafted to other uses. We shall therefore adhere to the word, idealism, taking it to signify simply that whatever is ultimately real in the universe is such stuff as ideas are made of rather than such stuff as stones and metals are made of. That is, if we are looking for the substance of things, the ultimate being which explains all other beings, we shall find it to be mental in nature,—the thinker and his thought, the will and its doings, the self and its self-expression. And whatever appears to be other than this, independent of it or hostile to it, as matter, or force or space and time, will be found to depend on the mind for its very existence.

135. Intuition is not a sufficient foundation for any philosophy; but we are not likely to achieve any true philosophy without it. Idealism has its first sources in intuitions, very ancient in the race. Indeed, philosophical idealism as a matter of history might be described as *an attempt to bring reason into the spiritual intuitions of mankind.*

And since these spiritual intuitions were first embodied in religion, idealism has often appeared as a philosophical outgrowth of religion.

Thus, in India, Brahmanism and Vedantism are forms of idealism. (See Deussen, System of the Vedanta.) In China, Lao Tze's philosophy, built on the ancient Chinese Tao doctrine, is akin to idealism. Northern Buddhism became an ideal-

ism in its metaphysics and in this form spread over China and Japan. Judaism (with the aid of the immortal Greeks) has given birth to Philo and Maimonides: Christianity, likewise with Greek aid, to Augustine, Abelard, Anselm, Thomas Aquinas, Duns Scotus and many others, —some of whom wavered, like Plato and Aristotle before them, between dualism (or pluralism) and idealism.

In modern times, idealism has taken on a new growth in independence of the religious consciousness, based largely on a *new intuition* which appears in Descartes, Leibniz, Malebranche, Berkeley, and their successors. The first step in the understanding of idealism will be an attempt to achieve for oneself the fundamental intuitions which have given rise to it in the history of human thought.

Chapter XX

THE INTUITIONS OF IDEALISM

(Outline)

136. The ancient intuitions of the race are intuitions which at some time or other come to every man, more or less clearly. Our business at present is not to defend idealism, but to get its point of view by achieving, if possible, each one for himself, these intuitions.

137. (1) That the ultimate and controlling facts of the world *are not the obvious facts.* The world of experience is a world of appearances; the reality is not on the surface. Hence any plausible view, any view of the first look, is not likely to be true: the plausibility of naturalism is not in its favor, but against it.

138. (2) *The ease with which we can imagine the world of experience to be an illusion disproves its finality.* Note: it does not prove that the world *is* an illusion; and idealism does not teach that it is an illusion. But it proves that the world does not contain in itself that absolute self-certification, necessary being, which we casually assign to it.

Literature is full of invitations to think of the

world as vanishing, or as a dream from which we can awaken. The fables of disguise, of chained lions, and the like, indicate how often nature has appeared to human fancy as a pretense, a garment assumed by some living will. Fancies of this sort are not intuitions; but there is intuition at their root: they are the more or less playful form in which men have expressed the intuition of non-finality.

139. (3) *Impulsive animism.* Animism is the belief in mental agencies as causes of natural phenomena. (E. B. Tylor, Primitive Culture, Anthropology; R. R. Marett, Anthropology.) Animism does not arise as a deliberately thought-out theory, but as a spontaneous reaction to events that affect us in any important way. Profound ill-fortune, calamity, provokes everywhere a *resentment* toward the world: but resentment is meaningless if the world is inanimate. *Fear* has been said to be the source of the god-idea (Chapter I); but fear does not "make the gods" unless the feared object is felt as personal, and therefore capable of entertaining an appeal. If prayer, as William James says, is instinctive in all peoples, it is because of a prevalent intuition that nature is a manifestation of will.

This intuition may come to clearness at first only in times of extreme emotion; as when in death, illness, and other crises, the claim of nature

to supremacy over the human spirit is defied. But it sometimes appears as a purely cognitive sense that matter, motion, energy, must have some *mental sponsorship;* that nothing could exist, eternally, if no mind in all the universe either knew it, or knew why it existed.

140. (4) *The subjective revelation.* This is the new intuition of modern times, above referred to. It is the discovery, most graphically expressed by Descartes, that the *self* is the most certain of all things, the only thing absolutely certain. Whether or not Descartes correctly described the thing of which he was so sure has been much debated since he wrote; but the main point remains, the locus of supreme certitude is somewhere in the experience of the thinking subject. (See reference to Descartes' Meditations, § 60, above.)

In this, Descartes was but the spokesman of the modern era, which is an era of heightened self-consciousness, repeating in its own way what the sages of ancient India had long ago discerned, namely, that the Atman or self is the central principle of being.

The previous intuitions might be called *a discovery of a self behind the world,* as when in the extreme solitude of the desert or the mountain top one is seized with a conviction that one is not alone. This fourth intuition might be regarded as *a discovery of the world within the self.* It is evi-

dently quite distinct from the intuitions of religion. Yet, like them, it has led its adherents to waver between dualism and monism. Descartes and Kant and Locke felt that they must leave something outside the realm of mind, whether matter or an unknowable "thing-in-itself." Spinoza and Schelling resolved matter and mind into a neutral and indescribable substance. It is in Leibniz, Berkeley, Fichte and Hegel that idealism comes out in its full clarity.

It is important to be able to see the world through the eyes of this intuition of the self, as containing, by way of its sensations and ideas, the whole of experience. Modern philosophy becomes unintelligible unless one can, at least dramatically, assume this point of view. The mind is a little thing, a mere item in an infinite universe; the mind is itself an infinite thing, the whole universe is mirrored within it. It is this paradox which gives idealism its modern form.

Chapter XXI

BERKELEY
(Outline)

141. We ordinarily think of the world in terms of vision: the real world is the world we see.

Berkeley begins by an enquiry into vision (Essay toward a new theory of vision, 1709). It leads him to the judgment that what we see is in part a mental fact.

142. We seem to see things at a distance, at a graduated scale of distance. The 'solidity' of the perceived physical world is bound up with the three dimensions of space. But does vision really present us three dimensions?

All of what we see can be pictured on a screen, a flat surface of two dimensions. We see spots of color. Distance is not given by the eye: it is inferred from certain signs. It is a mental fact, added to the facts of sense. (Thus in moving pictures we see things as far and near, as if the curtain had depth.)

What are the signs of distance?

Not the lines and angles of the optical diagrams; for they are not directly felt. But we do feel the "turn of the eyes," the convergence of the

optic axes when objects are brought near. We also perceive the confusion in their outline, if they are brought too near (and we may add, the dimness, if they are far away). Also a certain strain of the eye in too near objects, when we try to focus them properly (and another strain, if we try to make distinct something far away). And if we assume objects to keep their same sizes, we judge them near if they look large, and far if they look small. Berkeley was not familiar with the stereoscopic effect of the different images on the two retinas. But he had enough to convince him that there are signs in the flat spread of color-spots which lead us to *think* distance—to interpret vision in terms of touch and muscular motion; and so to take as an outward fact what is really the work of the mind.

143. Berkeley infers that a person born blind would not, if he suddenly received his sight, have any idea from sight alone what distance meant; and so would find difficulty in judging the solid shapes of objects, such as cubes and spheres, from the picture presented to the eye.

The case of John Carruth, reported by R. Latta in the British Journal of Psychology, June, 1903, showed that the removal of a congenital cataract gave a very uncertain judgment of form, until movements of the hand came to the aid of sight.

144. But the apparent independence, or otherness, of the physical world is something more than the "externality" of visual distance. It consists in the fact that we think of things in nature as *substantial* or *material:* they have a felt solidity, and not merely a visual solidity. And what we see and feel of them seems to betoken a reality within them,—their 'substance.'

Berkeley's second book (Principles of Human Knowledge, 1710) is addressed to an enquiry as to what we mean by "material substance." Locke has already had trouble in saying just what he meant by this idea (Essay on Human Understanding, II, ch. 23; Rand, p. 249). He admits that we never *perceive* matter, but only its properties. He thinks, however, that we *mean something* by it as "that which supports the properties." Berkeley concludes that we mean nothing by it at all. The only "support" which a property, such as color, admits of is the support which the mind may be said to lend to its sensations or "ideas."

145. But perhaps the reality of physical things consists not in a mythical physical 'substance,' but in what Locke called their primary qualities, their shape, size, solidity, position, motion. Physical objects may lose their color in the dark, or in the absence of eyes: their sounds, smell, tastes, etc.,

may depend on the mind and exist only in the mind. But surely the object retains its solidity, size, position under all circumstances. These are the qualities with which physics calculates; and the mind cannot think them away. (Essay, II, ch. 8: Rand, 238 ff.)

But Berkeley shows, without difficulty, that the primary qualities and the secondary are inseparable. If the secondary are mental, so are the primary. If the mind produces color, it produces the expanse in which alone color can exist. We must credit it, therefore, with giving us not alone the third dimension, distance, but the other two as well.

146. In sum, for everything of the nature of "idea," to be is to be perceived: *esse est percipi.* Reality consists of perceptions and their perceivers; thoughts and their thinkers.

147. Berkeley is not averse to criticism; he invites those who doubt his argument to state where it is at fault. He anticipates our objections, and answers them in his books. The most persistent of these difficulties are perhaps these: that he seems to destroy the difference between reality and illusion; and that he fails to account for the existence of objects, when no mind perceives them, and yet we believe that absent objects continue to exist.

148. Does Berkeley's idealism destroy the difference between reality and illusion?

Berkeley believed to the contrary. In denying material substance, he denied only what no man ever really thought, because it has no meaning. He felt himself upholding the cause of common sense against the philosophers, who had invented the abstraction of 'material substance.' He is prepared to state in definite terms what the difference between reality and illusion is.

Reality is (i) vivid, strong, lively, distinct; it (ii) has order and coherence, we can trace it out in minute detail and it never vanishes under our hand, as dreams do; in particular it (iii) has biological consequences,—it causes pleasure and pain, the real fire burns, the real food sustains us, the real rock of Dr. Johnson's famous thrust displays its habitual inertia; it is (iv) for the most part external to our body, which of course does not mean external to our mind. (Our body is as much 'external,' if external means spatial, as anything else.) But all these qualities are qualities of *experience*, not of any substance beyond experience. They imply that reality is simply *standard experience*, and illusion is experience which fails to come up to the standard in some one or more respects. Hence the world retains under Berkeley's view all the reality that it can have in the mind of any man who is not misled by abstract ideas.

We have, however, omitted one characteristic of reality which seems to stand apart. It is (v) active or a product of external action. I do not make it. I have no choice what I shall see when I open my eyes. This means to Berkeley that it is produced in us by the only active thing we know, namely, a living spirit outside ourselves, certainly not by an inert material substance.

149. Does Berkeley's idealism leave absent or unperceivable objects out of account, such objects as atoms, or unknown stars, or the forces with which physics reckons? Or simply the furniture in houses at night, the unobserved interior of the earth, etc.?

Berkeley's reply here is complete also. The fragmentary world of direct perception is made, by scientific thought, into a complete and continuous whole. Of this supplement to perception, it is obviously in the first place, for us, an object of *thought;* and thoughts are not out of mind. Science does not use 'substance': it only uses *law*, the rule by which experiences follow one another, depend on one another, and so are always supplementing one another to make up a complete world-picture.

When we say, then, that nature exists when no man perceives it, and that it existed before man existed to perceive it, we can only mean that the laws continue to hold, backward as well as for-

ward; and this may be true if there existed an eternal mind to think them. The mind of God is the guarantee, and the only guarantee, for the eternal endurance and order of nature.

Chapter XXII

SUBJECTIVE IDEALISM
(Outline)

150. We wish now to consider the argument of idealism in independence of Berkeley's line of thought.

The negative proposition of idealism is that nature is not *independently* real. It is real, in the sense defined by Berkeley: it has an internal standard which corrects illusion. But it is not real as an independent, self-sufficient being: its reality is derived from the life behind it.

The illusion of nature's independence comes very largely from the belief that the objects which we perceive are the *causes* of our perceiving them, in other words, that there is in nature a genuine and original activity which can affect the mind, and which does in fact produce our sensations.

This impression can be shown conclusively to be mistaken by an argument independent of Berkeley's. The argument consists in assuming that the theory of independent natural activity is true, and observing that it leads to self-contradiction.

151. Take any object in nature (N) and any observer (S), and follow the naturalistic explanation of how S comes to know N.

Let N be a candle, for example, and let us trace the course of the physical action of the light through the eye to the retina and the brain. The event in the brain is not itself luminous, nor candle-shaped; but on the basis of that brain-event, and at the same time with it, the mind (S) receives an impression of the candle. Designate this impression as *n* to distinguish it from the real candle, N. It is the effect; the candle-light is the cause: cause and effect are obviously not identical.

We have now to reflect that we who follow this process are ourselves observers of the candle, and are *in the same position* toward the object in which S stands. Let me take myself as an example, and designate myself as S′.

My impression of the candle, n′, will then be different from the candle itself, N.

But now, which is the impression and which is the candle? I cannot disown my impression: the impression is *what I have*, just as for S, the impression *n* is what he has. But what I have is just what I have been calling N. N must be my impression, then, and not the real candle. The real cause has slipped away from me; and I am left with a world composed of *n's*, a world of my impressions.

The objects which I perceive are *not the cause* of my perceptions; for they *are* my perceptions.

Beginning with naturalism (or natural realism), we end in subjective idealism, which contra-

dicts it. This does not prove subjective idealism to be true. It proves my original assumption of natural realism to be wrong. If subjective idealism is true, it needs further evidence.

152. Further evidences for the inclusion of experience in the mind:

(*a*) There is no jar or break or discernible line between perception and memory. But the past exists only in the mind. Therefore the present presumably exists in the same manner.

153. (*b*) What is included in the word mind? A mind would not be complete without its thoughts and its sensations. But the objects of nature are objects either of thought or of sensation. Hence there is nothing in nature which is not an integral part of what we mean by mind.

154. (*c*) When we think of nature as other than mind, we think of its "externality" or its "objectivity." The question is *what we mean by* externality or objectivity. Whatever the answer, objectivity must be something I mean or think. And the effort *by thought* to get beyond the mind, is evidently doomed from the start to failure: The mind may always say,

> When me they fly, I am the wings

It is true that thought always brings us nearer to reality; but it is also true that the more we

think, the more thoroughly the object is taken up into the subject. Kant's Critique of Pure Reason is an attempt to show that not only space and time as the empty framework of nature, but also the ideas of substance and causation and interaction, of quantity and quality, all of which go to make up the physical objects with which science deals, are *thoughts* by which the mind shapes the raw material of experience. (Watson, Selections from Kant, pp. 92–128.)

***

155. If the hypothesis of natural realism disproves itself by being followed out to its consequences, the hypothesis of subjective idealism also leads to difficulties. If we state subjective idealism in its extreme form it proposes that for each self the world is within *his mind*. The first sentence of Schopenhauer's great work is a clear announcement of this view. *Die Welt ist meine Vorstellung.* It is a literal and unqualified acceptance of the subjective revelation, which reveals the whole universe of my experience as within me. What are the consequences of this view?

156. (*a*) The *plurality of worlds.*

If my world is made of my ideas, and my ideas are products of *my activity*,—they are what *I* think,—then for each thinker there must be a separate space-time world with a separate nature

in it: there will be as many worlds as there are minds. This conclusion is accepted by Leibniz, in his theory of "monads," each monad being a complete microcosm to itself. (Leibniz, Monadology, Rand, 199–214.)

157. (*b*) *Solipsism.*

If my world is made of my ideas, I cannot forget that my neighbors are parts of my world, and that I have ideas of them also. They also must be taken up into my mind; and I shall be dealing not with my real neighbors, but only with my ideas of them. Each person is shut up to himself alone, *solus ipse.*

Leibniz was also willing to accept this conclusion: the monads, he said, "have no windows." And not a few thinkers have felt that the conclusion is logically inescapable; and that we can rescue ourselves from it only by a wrench of faith which is pragmatically, but not rationally, justified. Others maintain that it is obvious that we do not *perceive* other minds than our own; but that we have good reason for believing in them. We *infer* the existence of beings not ourselves. But how by inference, that is, by thought, can we escape the circle of subjectivity?

158. (*c*) *God also included.*

Neither Descartes nor Berkeley is a subjective idealist. Both believe that experience is a result

of an external activity, not of my own solely. Both depend on God to escape from the magic circle of the self. Berkeley appeals to the knowledge of passivity in sensation: but *is not the sense of being acted upon* also an "idea"? I have the idea of my passivity, and the idea that this implies an agent. But these again are my thoughts. And God becomes an hypothesis, an object within my mind and made by my mind. Is there any better reason for believing in God than for believing in matter, or in other minds? Or rather, as objects of belief, must not God and other minds alike be taken within my own mind?

159. These consequences do not constitute a disproof of subjective idealism. They do not contradict it. But subjectivism meets also the vigorous opposition of certain *intuitions*, which must be set side by side with the intuitions leading to idealism. We have an intuition that we are *not alone*, and that the figures we deal with are real and present persons. We also have an intuition that the space and time of our experience is identically the *same as their space and time;* and that the world of nature is therefore one and not many.

These intuitions, especially the first, are so strong that many have taken it as a sufficient disproof of any philosophy to show that solipsism is one of its consequences.

But we are bound, if we believe in reason, to

turn these intuitions also into conceptual form, and not leave them as simple dogmas. It won't do to refute solipsism by merely refusing to believe it.

160. Professor R. B. Perry gives a rational criticism of subjective idealism, by pointing out the fallacy of the argument from the "ego-centric predicament." (Present Philosophical Tendencies, 129–132.) It may be taken for granted that everything we think is a thought: we cannot get away from our own experience. But it is fallacious to generalize on this basis to the proposition that nothing but my experience exists; for the "predicament" simply prevents me from getting the *negative instances.*

161. This criticism, ingenious as it is, seems to me hardly to touch the root of the matter. The trouble indicated by the above consequences of subjective idealism is not a fear that there may exist objects which, because of our ego-prison, we do not find; the trouble is that this *idealism seems to dispute what we do find*—the other persons here present, the singleness of the world. It is to these intuitions that we must do justice.

We come nearer to the heart of the difficulty when we observe that, just as Berkeley could show that real and unreal are distinctions within experience, so *self and not-self are distinctions within experience.*

Solipsism is a self-refuting position. For whoever says, "I can know only my own ideas," admits that he has an idea of knowing something else than his ideas; otherwise his proposition has no significance. He must, mentally, get out of himself in order to assert that he is confined to himself. So Leibniz, as philosopher, stands outside of and reviews the monads, in order to frame the hypothesis that the monads have no windows. His own monad must have had at least a door!

162. It is the nature of knowledge to lay hold on what is not myself. An idea is, generally speaking, an idea *of* something not identical with the thinker.

The truth of subjective idealism is that whatever I know or have an idea of *becomes mine.* I remember it, take mental possession of it, use it in imagination and dream, reproduce it in a thousand ways. There is nothing we perceive which we cannot reproduce; and indeed, by retaining, we immediately proceed to reproduce every incoming impression. The world *becomes* my idea. But in its first presentation it is not mine. And while Kant and Leibniz are right, that sensation itself is an active process, they are wrong when they suppose that because of this activity, we are not *also passive* or receptive. Kant insisted that we receive the *stuff* of experience, but create the *form:* the truer view is that we receive both stuff

and form, and re-create both. Experience does come in to us from outside.

The real question, then, is as to the *nature of this outside and active reality.*

163. Here, the naturalist wishes us to go back to the position that this not-self consists of matter or energy. But this we cannot do. This position is untenable in reason (§151); just as Bergson has made it untenable in intuition. The true philosophy must preserve all that is true in subjective idealism; the destruction of material substance, or of the independent world of nature,—the negative proposition of idealism,—cannot be undone. There can be no going back to naturalism.

Also, the positive proposition is true, that reality is of the nature of *mind.* The error lies solely in the possessive 'my.' There is something beyond self, as real as my self; but that outer reality is not matter, it is *other mind.* That which acts upon me in sense-experience is some mind other than my own, and presumably greater.

For the only thing that can limit or act upon a self is another self. Self is like space: it can only be limited by something of its own kind. Reality is what corrects our errors; but what is that? When I rectify a mistake, it is because a false judgment is displaced, not by a dead fact, but by a true judgment. The true judgment is what is forced upon me. But a judgment belongs to a

judging mind. The world of reality, therefore, which is the world of truth, is the world of a universal and final judgment, a universal self.

We thus pass from subjective idealism to *objective idealism.*

And we proceed to consider the position of objective idealism both from the point of view of nature, and from that of our social world.

***

(Note: Idealism has too long been identified by its critics with the subjective theory of knowledge: it is time for a better understanding.

There are no solipsists—unless Mr. Russell and Mrs. Ladd-Franklin are still in this category. Experience is knowing a reality not ourselves. We have never been shut up to ourselves. The only question is, What is that *other thing?* Idealism does not answer idly, My thought (though the answer is not wholly untrue,—it is simply uninstructive). It answers, Some conscious life exhibiting itself to my thought. Experiencing is intercourse with a not-self: but it is not *staring across,* as over a chasm; it is a *passing across.*

The subjective intuition itself we fail to estimate at its legitimate value, because too much has been built upon it. It continues to impress us as an epistemological trick; and we are satisfied when we have 'refuted' it, or bluntly rejected it, that we have disposed of it, root and branch. Finding that it is not the complete solution of the world-riddle, we fail to see in it a partial indication of world-structure. It has amply shown that the factuality of things is not their essence: in

some way, their being is what they *mean*. Some of the results of the subjective analyses are ignored because they have so thoroughly gone into our life blood. Materialism is dead. What we have is 'experience.' And as preliminary analysis of experience, if not as finalities, Hume's distinctions, the phenomenological point of view, neo-realism itself, have become possible.)

Chapter XXIII

OBJECTIVE IDEALISM

164. Objective idealism meets half-way the feeling of naturalism that nature does not belong to me, the private self, but existed before me and will exist after me.

It also retains all that is valid in subjective idealism. Subjective idealism has shown beyond question that materialism is an impossible philosophy. And it has given strong support to the view that reality is mental, by showing the genuine creative power of the mind. For though the experience of nature is first given to us by an outside agency, we at once proceed to interpret and reproduce what is given us: we are first passive and then active. It is the extraordinary extent and power of this silent activity which alone justifies the audacious hypothesis of objective idealism that a mind *could* create nature, that the reality behind and within nature *could* be mental.

165. We can best appreciate what mental activity can do by considering the process of dreaming: for in sleep the intrusions of outer reality are —not abolished, but reduced to a minimum. The vivid dream has all the concreteness of experience.

It often exceeds reality, both in the direction of realizing wishes and ambitions—for it is most completely in dreams that our "dreams come true"—and in the opposite direction of giving actual shape to our chief fears and dreads. We seem passive to our dreams as to our waking experience; the conscious self has little power to control the course of the dream event. Yet the dream must be, in all pictorial detail, the product of our minds, our subjective imagination.

Now in waking hours, the mind is similarly active, though its activity is partly overborne, like stars in daylight, by the superior vividness of what we call the 'real' world. But it is not wholly overborne: it is easy to demonstrate that we are contributing every moment to the fabric of what we perceive. We hear a sound; we immediately interpret it as a 'step,' a 'bell,' an 'auto horn,' adding a visual image to the sound. Even in direct vision we see very largely what we expect to see rather than what is there,—otherwise the professional magicians would find it harder to deceive us and proof-reading would more certainly see the mistakes in spelling. Some of the arts depend on this mental supplementation of fact. A 'two-color' process in coloring moving pictures uses only reds and greens; but the observer sees a much fuller gamut of color, supplying the blues and yellows from his own resources, and enjoying the picture as though they were there. In such pictures, con-

tinuity of motion, distance, and some elements of color are all supplied by the observer. Thus the very stuff of sensation, which even Kant assumed to be imported into the mind, is to some extent the product of the mind.

All this activity of ours is, of course, secondary: its materials are derived from some previous experience, for the most part. But what it shows is that there is nothing given in experience which we are not *capable* of reproducing. We are not the original creators of our world, but we are apprentices in creativity: we are learning how to produce a world out of our own store. Just as, when we read history, there is nothing there recorded which is not of the nature of ourselves (Emerson's essay on History), so, as we apprehend nature, there is nothing in its fabric which remains alien to our powers of reproduction.

It is the reality of this creative power of the human mind which gives substance to the hypothesis of objective idealism: we have in our own being something like in kind to the activity which produces nature and presents it to us.

166. That supreme mind would indeed differ from our own, and not merely in greatness: it would also be different in quality. Our minds can only create after they have learned from experience; but the world-mind must bring forth the qualities of experience from itself, without pre-

vious pattern: it must therefore be wholly active, not partly passive. Further, in its deliberate thought of the world, which is the creation of the world, it presents the world not alone to itself but to us; and this process of *communicating* the world-perception to other minds is evidently a different process from that of simply imagining an object for oneself.* Thus the world-mind, while sharing with our minds the essential elements of thought and will which justify the term 'mind,' is profoundly different from our minds.

But these differences do not affect the main hypothesis: that the reality of nature consists in its being willed (and therefore thought) by a creative mind.

167. It has sometimes been taken as a sufficient proof of objective idealism that it avoids the difficulties of both naturalism and subjective idealism, while satisfying the idealistic intuitions of the race. It is the hypothesis to which we are naturally led when we try to combine what is true in subjectivism with what is true in naturalism. It is, in short, a "synthesis" of these two incomplete and imperfect views.

This is sometimes called a *dialectical* proof: the 'thesis' (naturalism) leads to the 'antithesis'

* Our own existence, as minds distinct from the world-mind, has also to be accounted for. Into these and other problems which his hypothesis involves, the objective idealist inquires in such constructive works as Josiah Royce's The World and the Individual,—see especially the second volume.

(subjective idealism); and these in turn lead to the synthesis.

But all we can fairly say of such a synthesis is that it is a better theory than either of the two earlier theories: it accounts for all the truth so far brought to light. It may, in turn, be superseded (unless every effort to depart from it brings us back to it). It would thus be in order to seek other evidence that nature depends upon a creative mind. Let me mention some of this evidence, not by way of proof but by way of indication:

168. *That as life comes only from life: so mind comes only from mind.*

Pasteur made it probable that under present conditions, living organisms come only from preceding living organisms. Bergson in Creative Evolution may be said to have generalized this doctrine, to the effect that all life in the cosmos comes from a single source, *l'Elan vital.* There is reason to believe that Bergson's "life" is mental in nature; and that the doctrine can be further specified in the form "Mind only comes from mind." When mind seems to "emerge" from something non-mental, the particular arrangements of matter, nerve-cells or brains, which serve as its physical organs, become organs of *mind* only if mind is already present in the universe.*

* Lloyd Morgan, Emergent Evolution; L. T. Hobhouse, Development and Purpose. S. Alexander, in Space, Time and Deity, takes an opposing view.

169. *That causality is purposive.*

In our chapter on "The Newer Teleology" (§ 50 f., above) we showed that causality is compatible with purpose. We brought out no positive evidence that the causal energy of nature *is* purposive. But what is energy? Is it mere mathematics?

Schopenhauer believed that at one point we have an inner view of energy, namely in our own will. The energy which appears in the brain as chemical or electrical appears in the mind as will-energy; and this is its true nature. Spencer only carries this idea from the brain into the outer world when he argues that in lifting a weight the pull down must be equal in quantity to the pull up when the weight is held in equilibrium; and things can be equal in quantity only when they are alike in kind: the feel of the up-pull must then be some clew to the nature of the down-pull.

But there are certain signs, too, in the way in which scientists have treated the *laws* of energy, that they have intuitively assigned to nature a certain moral quality. In his experiments on the law of falling bodies, Galileo, hampered by poor technical facilities for exact measurement, had to retard the fall by rolling the body down an inclined plane. In doing so, he made the assumption that the velocity of the ball at the foot of the plane would be the same no matter what the slope of the plane. What was the idea that led to this

assumption? He reasoned that if we could vary the final speed of the ball by varying the slope of the plane, it would be possible to combine different slopes in such wise that by rolling the ball down the slope giving greater speed and then back again over the slope giving lesser speed, the ball could be made to rise higher than its source. And this he held to be impossible, on grounds which we should to-day recognize as the principle of the conservation of energy; but which to Galileo meant simply an unproved conviction that there was a certain integrity in nature's operations which never encouraged the wish to get something for nothing. Nature he felt to have something of the character of a just judge, implacable, perhaps, but reliable, invariable, impartial.

The laws of nature have sometimes been likened to the *habits* of living beings (Royce, The World and the Individual, vol. ii, 226): certainly they are arrangements to which the habits of living things within nature respond. The above considerations suggest that the laws of nature may have a rational meaning; and that the events of nature —though not expressing, like our own deeds, so many separate impulses of will—may express a consistent will animating the whole cosmic order.

170. *That law is an expression of intelligence.* Indeed, the very notion of *law* in nature is baffling when we try to exclude mind from nature.

We commonly take physical laws for granted, as descriptive summaries of the regular sequences of events: when x happens, y follows. That is, the appearance of x constitutes a sort of signal for the appearance of y. Now we know well enough what it means for a mind to perceive a signal and make the appropriate response. But we have not the slightest idea what a signal might mean in a perfectly inanimate world.

Take one of the simplest of laws, Newton's conception of gravitation: this implies that the motion of every particle in the universe is continuously and instantly responsive to the position and mass of every other particle in the universe. How is such a thing possible! It is one of the tremendous assumptions we make, and legitimately, when we are concerned only with the description of what happens. But it is none the less staggering; and for philosophy the question, How, will not down.

Lord Bacon was prepared to credit material bodies with a sort of apprehension, though not a conscious perception, of each other. Hermann Lotze (1817–1881: see Perry, Recent Past, 90–91; Rand, 745–757) was not ready to attribute this degree of sensitivity to each particle. He pointed out that the many changes of the universe can be regarded as *one change*, a vast equilibrium constantly disturbed and constantly restored. And he proposed that this type of change implies a

single mind, within which every partial change is instantly adjusted to every other partial change.

We readily grant, as Lotze points out, that human law only exists when it is thought of: if all citizens were asleep, the law of the state could only in Pickwickian sense be said to 'exist.' How, then, do the laws of nature exist? Only in the sense that events occur "according to" them: they are "observed" if not "obeyed." And this would seem to imply *knowledge*, if not in the parts of nature, then in the whole. For a law, a way of acting, is a generality, a 'universal': and a generality can only be apprehended by a mind. Such is Lotze's thought.

171. If these indications are true, we should be justified in regarding the order of nature as the literal presence of a Reason in nature. The cosmological argument for the existence of God (§32, above) inferred from nature as an effect to an intelligent Creator as a cause: this Creator was distinct from the created world. The view of objective idealism would be that the world-mind is *within* the processes of nature: that those processes are the very reasonings of that mind; the passage from cause to effect is its *drawing* of consequences, its consistency of thought and steadfastness of purpose. The progress of science would be, not in a figurative but in a literal sense, the tracing of the world-thought. And the fact

that science *can* think the world, that successful hypotheses can be found, would be understood by the fact that the world is nothing else in its fabric than the object of an eternal thought.

The teleological argument, likewise (§32, above), would be reinstated on a different footing. It is not that the world as a finished result is to be ascribed to a beneficent Deity as an external designer. But the very march of nature, the *change* of the world as well as its being, is the working of a present cosmic purpose within the frame of events. Nature is moving not only out of the past but toward the future; and, whether we can discern it or not, there is meaning and value in what now is, and in its motion, and in that toward which it moves.

Chapter XXIV

WHY NATURE EXISTS
(Outline)

172. The hypothesis of objective idealism does not require that we should know the purpose for which nature exists. Yet it would become more convincing if we could get an inkling of that purpose. It would be confirmed if we could gain a direct experience of that world-mind in its creative activity. We shall enquire whether either of these further steps can be taken.

173. There are many sporadic suggestions of a purpose behind nature: its occasional beauty, its deeper and undiscovered harmonies which the mind suspects or faintly discerns, the prevailing will-to-live of its myriad creatures, even if not their happiness. But these are too fragmentary to constitute *the* meaning of nature; and against them must be set an endless amount of what to our eyes at least is ugliness, waste, and cruelty.

What we need lies beyond these piecemeal patches of perfection, namely, some sense of meaning in the existence of nature *as a whole*. Without this, these confused and fitful lights hardly relieve our night-like ignorance.

174. The post-Kantian idealists must be credited with seeing the nature of the problem and beginning the solution. The fact that physical nature is the polar opposite of mind,—spatial, quantitative, unfeeling,—that it resists, thwarts, opposes us,—it is this very hostility and deadness of nature that they seize upon as revealing its primary purpose. For it is of *just such opposition* that mind has the deepest need.

Thus Fichte. Fichte took the essence of mind to be will: will must express itself in action: action means the forming of stuff, or the overcoming of obstacles. There must be stuff, obstacle, or else no will and no mind. In 'work,' man wins his first moral victories, and learns his first moral lessons,—industry, truth to fact, perseverance, foresight, courage. In order that man should be moral, there must be a material world: nature is "the material for our duty, made sensible." If, then, we can conceive that the dutiful man is an object of value to the world-mind, we can see a purpose in the presentation of nature. For Kant, duty was the gateway to belief in the supernatural (§67, above); for Fichte duty is the gateway to the understanding of nature. Without effort, no morality; without opposition, no effort; without a world of physical facts, no opposition. Nature exists because it is a necessary condition of the moral life of finite minds.

175. In Schelling and Hegel we find a further

meaning in this opposite-of-mind which we call nature. Nature is necessary in order that mind shall attain *self-conscious self-possession.*

There are two stages of knowledge of one's own land or of one's own language: the knowledge one has by living in the land or using the language, and the knowledge one has when after travelling in foreign lands, one returns home. It has been said that he who knows only one language knows none: it is by comparison with something else that one appreciates the *meaning* of a thing.

In a similar way, Hegel suggests, mind must, as it were, abrogate itself in order to appreciate itself: it must wander in a world alien to its nature and come to itself again. Nature is this foreign land; nature is the "otherness of the spirit." Out of nature comes the mind, because nature is the mind in disguise. It begins with ignorance and gains knowledge; thus it appreciates knowledge. As many a gifted person wastes his gifts because they are to him not gifts, but simply natural perception,—he lacks the sense of his own power; so even perfect intelligence would be an incomplete and imperfect thing without that self-measurement born of the journey from ignorance to knowledge. Morally, also, the spirit of the world is incomplete as perfect unawareness of evil: the contemplation of sin must enter, if not sin itself, in order that the race shall come to that clear-

headed rejection of sin which we call virtue. Evolution, Hegel regards as the Odyssey of the spirit coming to itself.

The ultimate law of the world is the paradox, Die to live: He that loseth his life shall save it. There is a "dialectic" in the structure of the world and of history. The thesis (abstract idea or abstract perfection) must take shape in its antithesis (fragmentary, imperfect, shattered, plural, material existence) in order to win the synthesis (concrete perfection). So Reason enters Nature to become Spirit. Innocence by sin is driven from the Garden, but achieves (as the snake truly promised) the knowledge of good and evil and the eventual redemption of a self-knowing rightness of heart. The infinite which excludes the finite is an incomplete or "bad infinite" (typified by the straight line). The infinite must also be able to appear in the form of the finite, if it is to make wholly good its claim to infinity: the "good infinite" like the circle is the union of the finite and the infinite. The deepest truth of the world is the "incarnation" of the universal in the particular, of the world-spirit in the facts of sense.

176. These genial conceptions intrigue the imagination, and lure the mind toward a sense of initiation into the mystery of the cosmos,—a sense which some thinkers trust, while the more literal shrink from so much speculative boldness.

At their root lies a simpler consideration which the most literal can accept. An empty mind is no mind at all. To be a mind and to be occupied with objects are one and the same thing. Now a purely contemplative mind might be imagined which would be occupied solely with abstractions, such as numbers. But in order that the mind should have character or personality, there must be a difference between contemplation and concrete action. It must be possible to think first and act afterward. Now action means that a thought enters a world of sense, with infinite interconnections. Thus the world of sense is an essential part of what we mean by "will." Nature is necessary in order that the mind may qualify as will.*

Thus nature is not only useful to mind: it is necessary in order that mind should exist. We cannot have nature *and* mind, as if mind could be something by itself. Nature is so essential to the very notion of mind, that if mind cannot be a product of nature, nature must be a function of mind.

* * *

177. The final step of confirmation of the hypothesis would require (§172) a direct experience of the creative world-mind. Is any such experience possible?

We may reach an answer to this question by

* The Self, Its Body and Freedom, 81 ff.

enquiring whether any experience of a mind other than our own is possible.

178. We are so sure of the presence of other minds about us, that solipsism is enough to condemn any philosophy which leads to it (§157, 161). But how do we know these other minds?

It is evident we do not know them by sense perception; first because we have no such sense, and second because a mind is not the sort of thing that can be perceived by sensation. Is it, then, simply a theory or supposition which is verified by a million rapid and successful acts of social converse?

179. We must try, as far as possible, to put ourselves into the position of the beginner in social exchanges. How does the infant find his social environment?

Not by arguing from the analogy between his own body, and that of others: because he does not know his own body. Not by inference from some peculiarity of the behavior of living as against non-living things; for he makes at first no such distinction, and it is not altogether certain that any one can define what that difference is.

Not by response, as Royce suggests, nor by an ethical act of "acknowledging" their presence, as Muensterberg proposes; for these assume that the

infant already has the idea of other minds than his own, and is on the lookout for *signs* of their presence. But the presence of any such idea in mind would imply that he had some previous knowledge of other minds; since this idea cannot be either "innate" or a composite of other ideas.

All these theories make the primitive social experience much more intellectual than it really is. It does not appear that the human infant is first an unsocial individual, and then, by some course of thought, comes to the conclusion that there are other minds in the world. He appears to deal with the surrounding world from the first as though he believed it animated, and ready to respond to his demands. Let us examine somewhat more closely what an experience of another mind would be like.

180. This other mind, like every mind, must be occupied with objects; for an empty mind is no mind at all. To perceive this mind, I should have to perceive the objects it was occupied with: that is, I should perceive certain objects, and know that they were *common objects*, shared with some other mind.

Are there any objects in the world which seem to be habitually so regarded? Certainly *space* is usually taken as common to myself and others; so also are physical things in space. If we could find when we began to regard them as common ob-

jects, we might there find the beginning of our social experience.

But we cannot find that beginning, because we cannot find the time when they were regarded in any other way; and for a very good reason. Space is the *minimum* any two human minds have in common: if this minimum were lacking, communication could not get started. Communication can build from little to more; but it cannot build from nothing to something. Hence there must always have been some minimal object taken as common, and this minimal object seems to be three-dimensional space.

If, then, there is any real social experience at all, it must be that our experience of space (and its contents) is social; that is, that it is known from the first to be a region of experience which is shared with another mind than my own. And is not this the case? Early sense-experiences are not taken by the infant as private facts; they are referred by him to a world beyond himself, an objective world in connection with which he finds and addresses the companion he assumes always at hand to meet his demands as they arise; to him this world of not-self can only mean a world of another-self. Its physical otherness is derived from its social otherness, and not vice versa. It is because he feels himself to be not alone that he regards space as a common object and a point of beginning for further communication.

Thus in answer to the question whether an experience of the world-mind is possible, I conclude that our experience of nature *is*, at its foundations, an experience of the world-mind. Nature is not first experienced alone, and then tied-up with other observers. We are born social; nature is from the first the common nucleus of this aboriginal sociality. We gradually acquire the capacity of abstraction: we learn to think of ourselves apart from others, and of nature as apart from all of us. Naturalism is a high achievement of abstraction. But in its true character nature is *between minds:* to experience nature is to experience the world-mind in its creative activity.

(This argument is much abbreviated from the chapters referred to in The Meaning of God in Experience. It is difficult, and I present it here for the sake of completeness. The main thing to extract from it is its total effect, which I shall now summarize.)

181. The effect of this argument is simply to recall our minds to an elemental intuition which is only concealed from us by its omnipresence. It is not in rare and irregular experiences of high emotional tension that we have to seek a vision of the world-mind; for that mind is present to us in the permanent stream of plain physical sensation. When we take sensation as objective, not merely our private possession, we are recognizing it as the immediate communication of another mind to

us. It has often been argued that God is present to the human mind in *conscience;* and conscience has been thought of as very different from sense-experience. But I point out that there is an element of conscience or moral obligation in the way we commonly take sense-experience: we feel bound to treat it as a fabric not of fancy but of truth,—it is this very obligation which makes scientists and naturalists of us. And then I point out that this instinctive, loyal deference to the element of objective truth in sense-experience is the perpetual token that the world-mind is there present to us. That which makes naturalists of us is the very thing which, taken with more complete self-consciousness, should make of us objective idealists.

182. With this insight, we have at the same time another answer to the question regarding the purpose of nature. Nature exists in order that we may be social beings. To build up this intricate and endless network of give and take, co-operation and conflict, agreement and clash of judgment, there must be some neutral, colorless, lifeless, stable, indifferent base in the form of a common object: this base is nature.

Chapter XXV

APPLICATIONS OF IDEALISM
(Outline)

183. *The connection of mind and body.*

If nature is a bridge of communication between minds, and the body is part of nature, then the body according to idealism will be understood as part of that bridge. It is a way of getting across to other minds; and a way by which they get across to it.

But the body evidently differs from other parts of nature: it is more intimately connected with a particular mind than other common objects. If I cut a finger, the cut is in the common world, but the pain is my private property. Many bodily events could be described as public signs of private experience. The body becomes for those who can read it a *symbol of the individual mind.* It is, according to Schopenhauer, the external expression of the peculiarities of the will.

This agrees very closely with what we ordinarily feel about the body. It is not *identical* with self: it is more like a piece of property,—we speak of 'my body' as of 'my house.' Yet it is for many purposes *equivalent* to the self,—we say 'Here I am' not 'Here is my body.' The body is the visible

agent for self: it is, so to speak, legal tender for the mind of the owner.

This does not mean that the individual mind originally produces its own body. The body comes to each one, like the rest of nature, from beyond himself. We inherit our bodies as we inherit *ourselves*. But here also, the mind is first passive and then active: what it receives it re-creates. Only, the body while less plastic than imagination is far more plastic than the rest of nature: it cannot resist the print of the owner's choices. Thus at birth we have the body (and the mind) bequeathed to us: at forty we have the body (and the mind) built by our own wills.

184. *Freedom.*

In this capacity for self-building, we have the concrete expression of the freedom of the will.

Idealism accepts what Bergson has to say regarding freedom (§105); but adds that freedom depends on *self-consciousness*. All sorts of causes act upon and invade the self: an empty stomach causes hunger, a sudden noise causes alarm, a blow causes anger. There is a natural mechanical procedure in each of these cases, a 'reaction' which is no more free than the fall of the apple. But let me become *aware* of this process, able to say "I am becoming angry": then I am no longer absorbed in the anger, and the causes can continue only in such direction as shall carry out my deliberate

purpose. The power of self-survey (acting at the "threshold of consent" in the course of emotion) is the thing which puts distance between the history of a mind and the history of any purely mechanical process.

Many a habit establishes itself in the mind, more or less mechanically, and drops out of consciousness,—let us say a habit of evasion, of steering around a difficulty instead of facing it. It becomes a part of one's character, one's 'style.' The chances are that such a habit will persist and determine conduct until something or somebody makes the owner conscious that he has it. This is bound to happen in time if only because one's mental style is taking bodily shape and becoming visible to the public eye. At the moment one becomes clearly aware, "I am evasive, cowardly, soft," at that moment he has put a distance between himself and the evasive self: he has gained the beginning of freedom. Kant was right in saying that the mind is aware of its superiority to whatever is merely 'natural' in itself, its instincts, desires, habits: its destiny is not to destroy them but to use them. Self-consciousness deposes nature from master to servant of the free self.

185. *Human Destiny.*

Freedom applies immediately to the sphere of one's own choices. It gives no absolute mastery of the Nature outside of self: we can directly control

nothing but the meaning we make our deeds carry. There remain countless things not within our power;* there are tides of physical and social circumstance, age, disease, which no man can row against. Death conquers idealist and non-idealist alike.

But the idealist, who recognizes that Nature with its apparent indifference to his purposes, and its resistance to his thought and will, *ought to be there*, has certain assurances about his own place in the doings of the universe. If everything is subordinate to mind, then, he infers,

Nothing in the world can be meaningless; for mind acts always in view of meanings. Then, too,

Human beings, as among the things in the world, *must have a meaning;* and perhaps it would not be straining too far the apparent work of the evolutionary process to say, a presumptive importance. Be that as it may, it would follow further, that

Human valuations, however relative to human limitations, are *not contrary to absolute valuation.* Our way of judging values must be essentially consistent with that of the world-mind; for there could be no more meaningless situation than the production by a cosmic process of a race of valuers whose judgments were at odds with the true judgment of values. Our interest in knowledge, in beauty and in rightness cannot be entirely off the

*Cf. Epictetus, Discourses, Book I, ch. i.

target. Or, to put it positively, in these appreciations of ours, we must come close to an immediate grasp of the ultimate sense of existence. And if this is true, we may perhaps assume, further, that

Nothing is foreclosed as impossible, in the direction of our profoundest will; though we have no inkling as to the manner in which such desire is to be realized.

As to death and survival: death, we say, conquers idealist and non-idealist alike. Only, to the idealist, it is not a lifeless Nature that conquers: it is the law of the world-order, which is a significant order. If it is significant that his own life should survive, the death of the body need not carry with it the disappearance of his finite personality nor of his consciousness. Death, in this view of things, is the destruction of the *bridge of connection* with this particular group of fellow minds. It proves nothing as to whether there are other groups of minds in the universe, and other links of connection—other bodies perhaps, in other space-time orders—to be established with them. Whether one survives may well depend on whether one is fit to survive.

Chapter XXVI

IDEALISM AND ETHICS

186. We have been discussing idealism as metaphysics, not as ethics. We have forgotten (I trust) that the word 'idealism' seems to put in a proprietary claim upon 'ideals': no type of philosophy has a monopoly of ideals nor of their championship. But the time has come to ask whether idealism has something distinctive to say about the art of living. As a matter of history it has had much to say: most of the great ethical teachers among the classical philosophers have been idealists or have had an idealistic strain in their metaphysics.*

Since the opening of the nineteenth century, this situation has changed. Numerous thinkers have put forward systems of ethics professing to stand on their own feet, dependent on no theology nor metaphysics, idealistic or other. They raise the question whether ethical standards are not, after all, a natural phenomenon of human life; a product perhaps of our social instincts, or of our natural sympathy, or of the disposition to mutual

* Thus Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, Epictetus . . . the mediæval thinkers *en bloc*. . . . Kant, Fichte, Hegel, Schopenhauer. . . . T. H. Green, F. H. Bradley, Josiah Royce. The most notable exceptions prior to the nineteenth century were (to my mind) Epicurus, Hobbes, Montaigne, Shaftesbury, Bentham. Spinoza, certainly one of the greatest ethical thinkers of modern times, I should count among the metaphysical mystics.

aid (which Kropotkin has celebrated),—traits which even among the lower animals can be observed to mitigate ferocity and egoism. The rise of the science of psychology (spreading from eighteenth century England in all directions) would promote this view of ethics; likewise the experience of France since the "Enlightenment" and the Revolution. Before going on to consider what practical wisdom the idealists have to offer, let us, then, raise the critical question whether ethics is not an independent human interest, without any legitimate tie to any type of metaphysics.

187. Practical life is occupied—to put it summarily—with two concerns, the adoption of ends, the selection of means. All the issues between wisdom and folly, or between right and wrong, can be put in these terms: what goods do you seek? what means do you use in obtaining them?

But goods or values are matters of experience, not of speculation; and the best ways to reach them are likewise pointed out by experience, sharpened by scientific knowledge. The qualities of things which make them seem good or evil to us, harmful or beneficial, are matters of fact—i. e., of the relation between human nature and its surroundings—not of metaphysics. How could the qualities or values of things be changed by believing the universe as a whole to be living or dead? Colors, tones, odors, and their combinations will

be pleasant or unpleasant, harmonious or clashing, according to the laws of their own natures and of psychology, in every conceivable universe.

How could the belief that some all-knowing mind is the author of nature make beauty more beautiful, or human kindness more beneficent, or justice more noble? In any kind of world, materialistic or other, health and liberty are worth having, disease and poverty are evils to be banished, self-control brings self-respect, treachery disorganizes life. These are matters of cause and effect. The dialectic of experience teaches these things to the race;* they get embodied in proverbial wisdom; every new generation receives them from its elders, more or less disbelieves, experiments for itself, and finds out their truth at its own cost. The *ends or values* whose attainment constitutes human happiness remain eternally fixed in the nature of the quality itself; and the *means* to their attainment, the wise ways of life, are governed by the given order of nature and society. Metaphysics does not enter the calculation.

On this account, many thinkers have held that metaphysics (and theology likewise) so far from aiding ethics, tend to spoil it, by introducing alien and uncertain considerations. An ethics based on experience and reason stands firm, and recommends itself. An ethics based on the command of God or upon the supposed ultimate nature of

* See Human Nature and Its Remaking, chs. xxiii, xxiv.

things will shake with every doubt that assails our metaphysical capacity. Hence in France, the most rationalistic of modern nations, the prolonged political struggle to release the state from the church has been accompanied by an effort to establish a *natural* moral education as the only sort which can promise to be durable or socially safe. Russia, Mexico and Turkey are following the example of France. What kind of ethics can be set up without metaphysics?

188. An ethics is not a set of prudential rules indicating the most expedient ways of getting what we want: if it were, it would be a branch of the science of economy. An ethics is concerned with the difference between right and wrong: it is concerned with a *standard* (or 'norm') of some sort for our behavior, toward which we stand in the relation of 'ought,' obligation, duty.

Now human nature is no doubt capable of yielding standards of this sort, especially in social groups. Beginning our lives as impressionable members of the small community of the family, we find standards ready made for us in the kind of behavior and habit which our elders require or approve. And inasmuch as these elders, and our associates, commonly profit by and tend to approve unselfish behavior on our part, and to condemn the more outbreaking sorts of self-assertion, we grow up in the shadow of a certain de-

mand to diminish our natural sense of self-importance, our ego-centric morality, and to count ourselves as surely not more than *one* in the group and possibly a little less than one. No human group can fail to beget the standard which consists in reminding us that "other people exist too"; though no human group, merely by its natural authority, fully succeeds in overcoming our self-centred perspective and making the existence of others as weighty a value for us as our own. The standards of the group, be it noted, never become ethical standards merely by being required or approved by others: they are not *my* duty until I personally see them as such. But every normal human being does, in time, come to recognize that his group has some claim on him, and that he "ought" to be a serviceable member of it. He adopts what we may call a natural *social ethics.* Beginning with conformity to the trend of opinion in the group, he may go on to an independent and intelligent effort for the welfare of that group, even at the cost of some opposition to the prevailing sentiment and some sacrifice of his personal welfare.

Thus social ethics becomes a part of the ethics of *self-expression;* because the self which we have to express is, in part, a reasonable and social self. No normal man is happy in complete moral isolation or self-enclosure: hence a sensitive regard for the after-taste of our pleasures is capable of lift-

ing us a long distance above the level of the brute. It is these decent natural sentiments of regard for others and for common interests upon which the secular educators of France have been inclined to rely: "A respect for the human person, our own as well as that of the stranger; a respect for science, an admiration for its conquests, a hope that it will make still greater ones; a love of humanity, a confidence in its progress, a desire to contribute thereto; and to this end a love of *la patrie*,—

car la France, le pays de la Révolution et de la démocratie, travaille pour le bien de tous."*

189. If a civilization relies on such sentiments, it relies on something actual and authentic: but it becomes a matter of the utmost gravity for the future of such a society, how strong these sentiments are, and how much education can do toward making them *strong enough.* Education is not omnipotent; moral education is the most backward of our Western arts. It is not sufficient that these sentiments exist merely to the point of dramatic registration; and patriotism itself is not enough!

But beside the social standard, there are other standards present in some degree in all human nature. There is the *æsthetic* standard. Our acts have qualities of beauty or ugliness; and when we become aware of these properties, our personal

* Weill, G., Histoire de l'idée laïque en France, p. 359.

pride and sense of dignity are involved. No one desires to be ugly, repulsive, awkward or ungracious in the eyes of others, nor yet of himself.

As a strong ally of this æsthetic sense of inner personal quality, there is a natural law (we become constantly more aware of it) whereby these qualities become physically manifest in personal appearance. Swinishness makes its mark on the features. Hardness, worldliness, laxity, coarseness of feeling, become evident in trait, carriage, and gesture of the visible man. Personal vanity comes to the aid of ethics. In recent years it has led multitudes into a kind of physical discipline and restraint—the new asceticism! It has a future of unlimited magnitude!

This vanity is but the outer shell of the true æsthetic standard which is capable of forgetting the outer observer. Grace and amenity of conduct have intrinsic satisfactions of their own. They have contributed to form the ideal of the "gentleman" and the vanishing ideal of the "lady," compounded, as these were, half of æsthetics and half of the sentiment of honor. The third Earl of Shaftesbury thought that he could derive the entire code of morals from the standard of harmony.* And we remember the noble prayer of Socrates at the close of the Phædrus:

Beloved Pan, and all ye other gods that haunt this

* Characteristics of Men, Manners and Opinions, 1711.

place, give me beauty in the inner man; and may the outer and the inner man be at one.

190. The standard of *honor*, just mentioned, marks, I think, the highest reach of an ethics without metaphysics. It is a standard which implies a fine sensitiveness toward unenforceable obligations, such as the 'debt of honor.' In its history it has had a not wholly fortunate connection with aristocratic orders of society; as if it were only for those whom *noblesse oblige:* the honor of the knight, or of the officer as it has been interpreted in Continental military circles, tends somewhat to a superstitious concern for the show of respect to one's person. But there is a more genuine essence of honor, as in the pride of a Cyrano de Bergerac or in the laws of a reasonable contemporary chivalry.* It is still founded on distinction, a sense of superiority to vulgar selfhood: but that vulgar selfhood is one's own, and the sentiment of honor carries with it a scorn to take advantage of the many opportunities for feeding the material greeds of that self at the expense of a scruple. Honor is simply the flower of self-respect. It may lead a character into regions which neither the social standard nor the æsthetic standard alone would require.

191. These standards, we say, do not depend for their existence on any metaphysical theory.

* Cf. Alfred de Vigny, La canne de jonc, ch. ix.

They seem to be spontaneous products of human nature,—at least of some human natures; and we find germs of them in animals. Now our question is, Does a metaphysical belief, when it arrives, make any difference to them?

It is evident that, as we find them, these sentiments are both variable and vulnerable. We cannot assume that, merely by the mechanics of heredity, they will be generated in constant and adequate quantities. We may regard them as admirable and reasonable. But what if, in any group of persons, they do not exist, or only feebly exist? Can we beget them? The person who says, "I am not interested in honor nor in personal æsthetics; I find my happiness on the more vulgar plane. I make no apologies, for this is the way nature has made me,"—such a person would seem to be in a fairly impregnable position.

Education cannot "inculcate" sentiments the germ of which is not present. A student of mine once said, commenting on a course in ethics, "You can't prove that a man ought to love his neighbor. And if you could, that *would not help him to do so!*" Put it this way: you cannot prove to the unmusical that music is beautiful; and if you could, that would not help him to enjoy it. There is the central difficulty. And the actual situation is that while most of us love a few of our neighbors to a certain extent, very few of us love more than a few: the actual force of the sentiment of

brotherhood toward "mankind" is hardly more than that of a mathematical expression, an imaginary picture of a non-existent limit. Well-disposed toward mankind,—yes; glad to help, too, so long as the cost is not too great: the good-natured spirit of the prosperous; fair-weather benevolence. But capable of heroic sacrifice? Or of steadfast loyalty at all costs? Yes also; so long as one listens solely to the native impulse, and does not attempt to rationalize one's behavior. He who deliberates is likely to be lost. If metaphysics cannot create these liberal sentiments on which civilization depends, there are types of metaphysics which can, apparently, *undermine them* by exposing them as irrational. And if this is true, metaphysics is certainly not irrelevant to them.

192. In fact, the proposition that ethics has no need of metaphysics runs close to absurdity: it is as much as to say that ethics is indifferent to the nature of reality. Admit that ethical sentiments come out of natural human instincts; but remember that instincts are ways of dealing with reality. Instincts have no theories; but they have at times a wisdom which is deeper than available theory; they are attended by intuitions of the nature of the world wherein they operate.* The social instincts and inhibitions out of which our ethical standards arise are active long before we know

* See above, §87.

what these intuitions mean: but when scientific and metaphysical thought arises it will either corroborate or refute these intuitions; it will either sustain or discount those sentiments.

It is simply *not true that the values and qualities of things are fixed in independence of our thoughts about their natures.* Even in regard to tastes and odors, the squeamish have a need to know what a dish is before they can eat it with relish. Still more with the value we ascribe to our neighbors. We are bound in the long run to treat things and men according to what they are. As for these fellow men of ours, whom we are expected to regard as brothers and equals, the question is *What are they?* Answer that without metaphysics if you can. If they are biological organisms and nothing else, subject to the laws of cause and effect, they must be so treated. In that case, their worth varies through a long gamut, and there are "many too many" of them: it is no use pretending any sentiment of universal respect or fraternity; the principle of 'equality' is either a falsehood or a pragmatic assumption for small homogeneous communities, quite inapplicable to humanity at large. Obversely, if that sense of fundamental equality which is the basis of justice as well as of benevolence is to be given a lease of life, we must be assured that men are something else than organisms.

Now experience does something to indicate that

the cause-and-effect view of human nature is unsatisfactory: namely, it does not work. Study human psychology; find the "laws" of human behavior; then try to apply them in the management of men, and see what happens. Let them but get the suspicion that you are trying to practise a cause-and-effect policy on them, and they will spoil your game. Society cannot be worked out on the plan of causal-dealing. Our mechanical "organization" enthusiasts sometimes assume that it can be; they take for granted, let us say, the docility of labor, the predictable working of the 'economic motive'; and labor is likely to prove both indocile and uneconomic, capable of a self-sacrificing fury of resentment. Organization and pathology approach the criminal tendencies of men with cause-and-effect remedies, environmental and chemical; and crime continues to increase. We shall learn in time that *we can only motivate other men by what motivates ourselves;* by value-thinking, not by causal-thinking. The only successful way of treating them is to assume that they are rational, free and responsible; assume that they participate in your appreciations and sense of duty; stop trying to 'work' them, as you would work a machine, and begin discussing your mutual rights and obligations. Then you are no longer treating them as mere means to your ends; you are not trying to *cause* them, but to *reason* with them. You are showing 'respect'; and respect

must stand at the beginning of any honest fraternity. Thus far experience takes us; and we can say that no metaphysics will sustain a modern social structure unless it can justify this mode of treatment.

193. Now it is here that idealistic metaphysics strikes in. It declares that man *is* something different from the causal or biological machine, and that by virtue of what he is, he is worthy of respect. It puts a necessary foundation under the centre of the whole ethical business.

Kant was the first modern thinker to perceive and to state in unmistakable language this situation. He puts the matter dogmatically: "Now I say man exists as an end in himself, not merely as a means."* We call rational beings *persons*, he continues, because "their very nature points them out as ends in themselves." Whatever is a *thing*, as distinct from a person, we are at liberty to use as we like: it has a value just so long as we desire it; its value is relative to our wishes, and if we cease to care for it, that value declines. Things are not ends in themselves; and for this reason, their authority over our conduct is conditional: "If" we desire wealth or preferment, we must be diligent in our business; if not, we may be as lazy as we like. Such rules, Kant suggests, we may properly call "*hypothetical imperatives*": they

* Fundamental Principles of the Metaphysics of Morals, tr. by T. K. Abbott, 4th ed., p. 55.

remain binding only so long as one continues to value the object. But the value of persons has a different status: their worth is objective, independent of our variations of mood because based on what a person is, namely, a free being, capable of seeing an ethical point, and so of being a member of a society of rational creatures. The existence of persons, as ends in themselves, thus imposes on us a requirement which is unconditional, or as Kant phrases it, a "*categorical imperative*," a command without an "if":

> So act as to treat humanity, whether in thine own person or in any other, in every case as an end withal, never as means only.

This is one of the most impressive formulations of our moral common sense that has ever been made. We recognize at once its force and its effect. Besides defining accurately that element of underlying equality (running through all the inequalities among men) which is the basis of all legal right, and therefore of all equity and justice, it forbids all forms of what we call "exploitation." It clearly excludes slavery (Kant's treatise was published in 1785); for slavery is the literal treatment of persons as things, using them as means to the ends of others and not as ends in themselves. In so far as honest contract relations (include the wage relation) supplant relations based on compulsion, men continue to use each

other as means to their ends, but they also respect each other's freedom; so that the Kantian principle is complied with.

It also abets and clarifies the sense of honor: for it forbids that the personal principle in myself shall ever be prostituted to the service of material inclination. Don't make the mistake of supposing, Kant admonishes, that the element of free value-thinking in yourself is there purely for the sake of leading you to the satisfaction of your natural desires. It has its biological functions, no doubt: intelligence (like eyesight) has evolved as a means to all sorts of practically valuable ends. But having arrived, rationality (like eyesight) takes rank as an end, and not as a means only, and indeed as the chief good of life: to be a rational being is second to nothing in the satisfaction it gives; and no sacrifice of the personal quality, which constitutes the dignity of man, could be compensated by any amount of the tangible gratifications of the organic self.

194. This categorical imperative has other consequences. To treat persons as ends, and so far to treat all alike, allows—and requires—an element of logic to be introduced into the ethical domain. I must think of my actions as if others were doing them in my place: I must consider my action as if its principle or 'maxim' were to become a general rule for all; as if, in short, to act

were *ipso facto* to legislate for the universal community of persons,—"Let all follow the principle which I am now following." The categorical imperative can thus assume this form:

> Act only on that maxim of which thou canst at the same time will that it should become a universal law.*

In other words, cease making exceptions in your own favor: eliminate those modes of action which would show themselves self-contradictory if they became general. Do not allow yourself to lie, when the whole effect of the lie depends on that general habit of truthfulness which allows your language to be received at its face value. Do not allow yourself to steal, when the whole advantage of your theft depends upon having your stolen goods respected as your property. Do not kill, when the only value of your deed requires the continued protection of your own life by the standards of the community.

This is perhaps the more abstract aspect of ethics; but the pertinence of logic here indicates why some rules of law have made their appearance in all societies as thought becomes competent to overcome the ego-centricity of natural impulse.

195. In Kant's treatment of ethics we have the sense of getting close to the centre of moral

* Op. cit., p. 46.

life. It has had, and continues to have, a profound influence on the modern conscience, in the field of law as well as in that of personal morality.* Like every great formulation of human intuition, it is an approximation rather than a finality; and it must meet a criticism which is keen in proportion to its importance.

On the one hand, it is said that Kant's imperative is too empty, that it requires nothing specific. (One might say of the Golden Rule that it also commands nothing specific; yet few have had the folly to suggest that this rule commands nothing merely because it mentions nothing in particular. We have not found Kant's principles devoid of application.) On the other hand, it is said that it is too rigorous, and requires an impossible standard of human behavior. These two criticisms evidently tend to cancel one another.

The chief defect of Kant's theory is the absence of an independent metaphysics. Kant has argued that the moral law depends on a metaphysical belief for its validity:† but at the same time that the only ground for such metaphysical belief is this demand of the moral law. But metaphysics cannot sustain ethics if ethics is the only support of metaphysics. Kant himself is not an idealist in metaphysics; he is rather a mystic,

* See the contribution by Roscoe Pound to the volume Kant, 1724–1924, edited by E. C. Wilm.

† Section 67, above.

standing on the threshold of idealism. For this reason, the essential propositions of his ethics can only be stated in the dogmatic way we have noted: they lack theoretical support. Three dogmas form the pivots of his doctrine: "There is nothing good without qualification but a good will"; "Now I say that man exists as an end in himself, not merely as a means"; "Now I say that every being that cannot act except under the idea of freedom is really free."*

These dogmas are probably true, or nearly true: they make connection—as Kant intended—with the common moral sense of mankind. But there is a certain discrepancy between asserting the sole absolute goodness of the *good* will, and asserting the absolute worth of every person whether his will is good or not. And it is doubtful whether the worth of any person is purely intrinsic, without reference to the world in which he lives. Our own sense of personal worth is certainly variable; and dependent in no small measure on the conviction that we fulfil some function in the cosmos. (Mark, I do not say a social function; but a function having an objective worth of some sort, in the processes of the greater world.) The worth of men comes in part from their cosmic relationships. The "proof that a man ought to respect or to love his neighbor" must

* Fundamental Principles of the Metaphysics of Morals, pp. 10, 55, 80.

come, if at all, from recognizing that this neighbor has, or can have, the interests of the *whole* in his keeping.

It certainly will not do at the present moment in history to assume the worth of humanity as a dogma. The weakness which attends the "lay" or autonomous ethics attends also the ethics of Kant. For though slavery is out of countenance, there has never been a time when the disposition to make use of weaker brethren or of backward races as mere means for national or private ends was more wide-spread. If we are to treat all human beings as ends in themselves, there must be some metaphysical justification for doing so which we do not find in Kant; but which we may find in his successors.

196. *Hegel** sees human individuals as immersed in the living process of the world, which is at once the history of civilization and the history of a developing thought. Persons get both their freedom and their worth through participation in this universal process.

Our freedom is less an intrinsic quality, Hegel teaches, than something which grows, and of which we learn the meaning by various experiments, more or less mistaken. We are likely to try (*a*) the freedom of *aloofness*. Since by entangle-

* G. W. F. Hegel, 1770–1831. His ethical theory is best expressed in his Philosophy of Right. See Rayburn, Hegel's Ethical Theory.

ment we lose freedom, we seek liberty in detachment, absence of restraint, refusal to engage in common causes with imperfect comrades in an imperfect world. Regarding all inherited institutions, parties, churches, traditions as corrupted and corrupting, we are ready to abandon or if need be to destroy. We find that this sort of liberty is vainly negative, impotent and unsatisfying. We try (*b*) the freedom of *capricious self-assertion*, doing something positive, satisfying desires, but doing it when and as we please, making out an independent life according to individual taste. We find ourselves still unfree, for the self is one and not many: in the multitude of satisfactions it alone remains unexpressed and unfree. And impulse itself dies by being too much examined and consulted. We reach (*c*) a *concrete freedom*, a freedom which accepts the bondage we at first spurned, that of taking one's part in the institutional life of mankind. For all these imperfect forms of common life do, after all, embody at their core an element of reason without which we cannot come to ourselves, any more than without the imperfect family we could have come into the historical scene at all, or without the imperfect traditional language of our group communicate a single thought. We find that all laws, conventions, institutions can be, like language, either bonds or wings, according to one's degree of mastery. The art of life is to discern what is universal

in them, and to ally ourselves with that. Our highest ethical law is, *Identify thyself with objective Reason, as found in the institutions of mankind.*

197. *Royce** realizes that Hegel is right in demanding that the ethical will must have something more than formal rectitude and freedom; that it must come out of its self-enclosure and participate in the common efforts of men. But he finds that objective Reason not so much in institutions as in "causes" which from time to time emerge. These causes are likely to come forward because some element of Reason is *not* embodied in the actual order, and requires our service in order that it may be realized. Loyalty to causes is the primary ethical principle. And though equally conscientious men may conflict in their judgment and find themselves serving with equal loyalty opposing causes, there is one cause in which all can unite; for each opponent can respect the loyalty of the other. The absolute rule is, *Be loyal to loyalty* wherever found.

198. In our own view, all of these ethical principles are contained in one: *Universalize thyself.* Consider thyself a unique being, a view of reality granted to no other, which it is thy destiny to express: express this latent idea, make thy private

* Josiah Royce, 1855–1916. His Philosophy of Loyalty contains the discussion here epitomized.

feeling or intuition of the world the universal sense.

The ethical life begins with the summons to take experience as something more than a subjective pantomime: sensation itself I know I 'ought' to take as a sign of objective truth. My first duty is to gain and keep a common footing with the rational life around me. Regard for truth is the primary condition of any further moral progress: how far any two minds can get in mutuality depends directly on the degree of their sincerity toward each other. That is, we can serve men only by first serving what appear to be the more abstract elements of reason in the world, objective truth and right.

The service of objective reason has three stages. First, *alliance* with what is there (Hegel's insight). Second, *criticism*, which does justice to what is individual and unique in one's judgment, revealing the causes which are peculiarly one's own; setting one free from the onus of mere conformity and obedience to a dominating State or Church or Society or other incarnation of the Universal Spirit. Third, *re-creation.* The highest good of the individual life is not in the acceptance, nor in the criticism, but in the remaking of ideas and thereby of institutional life; effecting a change in the world which will last because it deserves to last; revising a law, painting a picture, building an arch, educating a child,—

acting in such wise that your deposit of truth finds its way into the universal current of life. In this way the instinctive "will to power" is given its due scope and satisfaction; and at the same time the sense of obligation to the hidden life of things is honored. A man's worth lies not in the psychological fact of his personality: it lies in his good will so to conceive his life and to fulfil this responsible function. This is at once the law of duty and the law of happiness.*

199. Suppose now that a man were minded to live by such ethical standards as these. Would it make no difference to him if he had some assurance about the nature of the world in which his work has to be done?

Suppose he were convinced of the metaphysics of idealism, and were to carry this out to the consequences we have already drawn:† That every human being has a presumptive meaning in the cosmic order; That our judgments of worth must be essentially valid; That our most universal standards, including those ethical standards of honor, beauty, loyalty, cannot be indifferent to the nature of things.

If one had carried his deduction so far, would he not also infer that since these standards are

* The Meaning of God in Human Experience, ch. xxi, The Prophetic Consciousness; Man and the State, ch. xxi, The Human Will; Human Nature and Its Remaking, chs. xi and xxiv.

† Section 185, above.

not alien to reality, it *cannot be a matter of cosmic indifference whether we observe them?* And could he any longer doubt whether his metaphysics were relevant to his ethics? Even if the content of the good life were not altered, the obligation to seek it would acquire a new importance. Or rather, obligation for the first time would find its genuine meaning: for in an indifferent world, the idea of obligation is a footless myth. In a living world, the call of duty is the summons to an enterprise in which one can never be ultimately alone.

This metaphysics carries with it a further presumption that the good will, as being in accord with the ultimate power of the world, is *ipso facto* succeeding in its unknown cosmic business; whereas neglect of obligation, betaking oneself to shams, and thus in Carlyle's phrase, parting company with the central realities, is in some unknown way undoing the possibility of such success. For the objective order of the world is not a mechanical but a moral order.

TYPE VI

REALISM

CRITICS OF IDEALISM: (1) REALISM

Literature of contemporary Realism: more or less chronological

Neo-Realism

(Precipitating the American discussion: Royce, J. The World and the Individual, vol. I, 1900, Lect. II, ii-iv; Lect. III.
Perry, R. B., Monist, 1901–1902. Royce's Refutation of Realism.
Moore, G. E., Refutation of Idealism, Mind, Oct., 1903; reprinted in Philosophical Studies, 1922.
James, W., Does Consciousness Exist? Jl. of Philos., Sept. 1, 1904; reprinted in Essays in Radical Empiricism, 1912.
Perry, R. B., The Ego-Centric Predicament, Jl. Phil., 1910; Present Philosophical Tendencies, 1912, Parts III and V. (Readers must note that the idealism which Perry so acutely criticises is defined as the doctrine that "to be and to be known are one and the same," a definition we can hardly accept).
*Holt, E. B., and others. The New Realism, 1912. Pages 2–35 gave a clear account of the motives of neo-realism.
Santayana, G. Winds of Doctrine, 1913.
*Russell, B. Scientific Method in Philosophy, 1914. Read Lectures i, iii, and iv.
Laird, J. A Study in Realism, 1920.

Critical Realism

Drake, D. and others. Essays in Critical Realism, 1920.
Santayana, G. Three Proofs of Realism (in Essays in Critical Realism, 1920); Skepticism and Animal Faith, 1923.
Broad, C. D. The Mind and Its Place in Nature, 1925.
*Montague, W. P. Ways of Knowing, 1925. Read especially the concluding dialogue, for literary as well as dialectical skill.

Metaphysics as treated by neo-realists

Boodin, J. E. A Realistic Universe, 1916.
Alexander, S. Space, Time and Deity, 1920.

Progenitors of contemporary Realism

Plato's doctrine of 'ideas' as in the Timæus and the Parmenides.
Aristotle's doctrine of individual substances (Metaphysics, *Z* and *H*).
Thomas Aquinas' view of created things and our knowledge of them (Gilson's masterly study; L. J. Walker's Theories of Knowledge).
Reid, Thomas. Inquiry into the Human Mind, 1764.
Herbart, J. F. Metaphysics, 1806.
Hodgson, Shadworth. Philosophy of Reflection, 1878.

About contemporary Realism

Perry, R. B. Philosophy of the Recent Past, Part V.
Riley, J. W. American Thought.
Rogers, A. K. English and American Philosophy, c. VIII.
Russell, B. Philosophy in the Twentieth Century, in Sceptical Essays, p. 68 ff.
Wahl, J. Pluralist Philosophers of England and America, c. IV.

* For an introductory attack, read these three passages. The important works of A. N. Whitehead are not mentioned here under the rubric of neo-realism, for two reasons: First, while Whitehead has certain affiliations with the realistic way of knowing, his metaphysics is quite too original and many-sided to be squeezed into this type. Second, his thought is still growing: classification is premature.

Chapter XXVII

REALISM

200. Modern idealism has become an imposing system of thought. Its principles have been applied to every department of life, to history, to art, to religion, to politics and law. After Aristotle and Thomas Aquinas, the greatest of all system-makers was the idealist Hegel (1770–1831). The genius of the idealistic thinkers of Germany combined with the influence of Berkeley to light new flames in England in Coleridge and Carlyle, in the Cairds, T. H. Green, F. H. Bradley, Bernard Bosanquet; in America, via Coleridge, in Emerson, the St. Louis school of philosophy, James and Royce; in France in Victor Cousin, Lachelier, Renouvier and Boutroux; in Italy in Croce and Gentile.

Idealism has at times appeared as simply another name for philosophy itself. For philosophy in seeking to understand the world must assume that the world is intelligible; that thought can penetrate the opaque screen of nature,—which is to say that the reality which explains nature is not itself opaque in turn, but as understandable by thought as thought is understandable by itself. Idealism would thus be simply the philosophical

form of that fundamental belief of all human aspiration that "the things which are seen are temporal, but the things which are unseen are eternal."

But the life of philosophy is in the critical thinking by which it reaches its beliefs; and it is dangerous for any philosophy to become an orthodoxy. For then it becomes a sort of convention to assume that its case is made out, and the mind of an age sinks into a somnolent content, not with a philosophy but with "one prejudice the more." It is for the health of idealism that it has always had its critics—naturalism and dualism, in wider or narrower currents, having remained side by side with it; and in recent years two other rivals have taken a new lease of life, realism and mysticism. These two propose to amend idealism in radically different ways, inasmuch as they are widely contrasted with one another.

201. Realism as a general temper of mind is a disposition to keep ourselves and our preferences out of our judgment of things, letting the objects speak for themselves. If we can say of idealism that it has a tendency to read the mind into nature, realism is in this respect its precise opposite. In the interest of allowing every object its full distinctive flavor, realism is inclined to de-personalize or de-mentalize the world, to see things starkly and factually in a spirit which it con-

ceives to be at once more objective and more scientific than that of idealism.

The realist is likely to feel in idealism some taint of human conceit, as if it were making man "the measure of all things." Mr. Santayana scores German idealism for its "egotism" in interpreting the universe as a grotesquely magnified Self. The realist sees the mind as a fragment of the world—and very likely as a minor fragment whose first step in wisdom is to learn to keep its place.

(Realism is a word frequently applied to tendencies in literature and art, and to certain disillusioned or unillusioned policies in politics. Realism in philosophy has something in common with these trends, but not too much. All realisms agree in their interest in objects as they are, in their confidence that we can see them as we are, and in their hostility to every impulse to substitute our wishes or ideals for the facts, or otherwise to make our conscious selves the centre of importance in the universe. Idealism in art, for example, insists that the essence of the object is its meaning or spirit, and is less particular about accuracy of drawing. Realism insists on faithfulness of detail, and rather goes out of its way to offend squeamish sentiments or preferences if it suspects them of shielding us from the all-important ugliness of the facts. Likewise in philosophy, realism is chary of all optimistic intimacy

with the heart of the world, and insists on the necessity of careful, minute, unbiassed and unshrinking analysis as the way to get nearest the reality of things. It puts facts plus reason into the saddle, and unlike the pragmatistic chooser of belief is prepared to find the world, thus examined, very far from what we would wish it to be.

So far, the various realisms agree; but beyond this general harmony in temper, the student would better forget realism in art or politics while thinking of realism in philosophy.)

202. This general temper of realism is evidently not enough of itself to constitute a philosophic type. Letting the facts speak without intruding ourselves and our wishes upon them is an attitude we have all had to strive for (and which empiricism especially cultivates); it is thus a form of intellectual virtue which no one would willingly admit himself to be without.

In this broad sense, then, *everybody is necessarily something of a realist.* The differences are differences of emphasis. Aristotle, for example, is in this respect more of a realist than Plato. He is less of a poet, and more of an observer. He rests on the hard nubbles of fact with a certain relish which Plato lacks; he enjoys the quirks of individual things; he likes to study the various kinds of thing in the world and to learn the different sorts of law they observe; he runs less

quickly to sweeping generalities which embrace the universe; he appreciates secondary principles and partial generalizations. In brief, Aristotle is a good deal of a scientist as well as a philosopher; he lives happily in those border-lands where science and philosophy meet. On this account he becomes the great divider of the sciences, writing separate treatises on mechanics, astronomy, botany, physiology, genetics, psychology, ethics, politics, rhetoric, logic, metaphysics; he is the outstanding system-maker among the Greeks, delighting in significant distinctions, and capable of leaving himself and 'the mind' out of account while he is occupied with other things.

203. Is it possible now to make a principle of this rather temperamental contrast between Plato and Aristotle? Such contrasts carry in them at least the germs of divergent types of philosophy.

The point of principle may be this: that Aristotle is more interested in uniqueness and difference among things, less interested in all-embracing unities, in fact somewhat distrustful of them. He finds himself able to consider things in nature for their own sakes, as largely independent of one another and without reference to the observing mind—indeed, it does not occur to him to lug the mind into the picture, except when he is making it a special subject of study; it is not an all-pervasive thing, but one of the many things that go

to make up the world. And being able so to consider them, he feels justified in regarding them as separable realities, and calls them all 'substances.'

Taking this as the characteristic realistic trait, we may say that realism is (1) *primarily a way of knowing*, a variant of rationalism roughly describable as a *preferential confidence in analytic reason;* and that this way of knowing carries with it (2) a metaphysical belief that the *objects we observe are in reality independent of us*, and of each other, essentially as they appear to be.

Thus, to the realistic eye, the joints of the world are loosened. The effort to describe the whole of things from one centre, whether material or ideal or any other, is abandoned as an artificial and unnecessary *tour de force*. All monisms are too hasty. We are bound to trust reason: but when reason "seeks unity" (§108), the realistic watch-dog in us scents danger,—the human wish for unity is all but certain to falsify the facts. Plain observation shows the world not as one thing (nor yet as two things,—though evidently dualism has a realistic motive), but as many things of many kinds. And while it is true that a closer scientific observation shows these things to be connected in various ways, there is still a radical difference between connection and unification. The ingredients of the world, each one a substantial reality, work together without being fused into one substance.

204. Prior to the arrival of modern idealism, this simple stage of realism was the prevailing philosophical attitude. It was quite consistent with a belief in God, so long as God was not thought of as the whole universe, but simply as the most high being, from whom we must distinguish the world of nature and of men with their myriad separable entities. Thus Aristotle thought of God as the 'final cause,' an eternal self-contemplating Reason who does not create the world, but toward whom, as the essence of goodness, all things in the world strive out of indeterminate stuff. Thomas Aquinas (1227–1274), the great scholastic systematizer, bringing together Aristotle's metaphysics and Christian theology into a vast synthesis, was a theistic realist of similar type. God creates the world; but God is not the world which he has created, nor does he strictly speaking include the world. Each may be thought of and studied for itself without reference to the other. The relation between God and the world is not that of a thinker and his thought; but that of an original substance and a derivative, yet separate, substance or group of substances. John Locke also (1632–1704) is a realist of this type; though the difficulties he faced, and candidly described, while trying to answer the question, What *substance* is,—the substance which gives the core of reality to these many individual beings, led directly to Berkeley's idealism.

Thus to the verge of modern times realism appears as a sort of direct, unfettered, compendious enjoyment of a pluralistic world, with the same satisfaction in its variety as we find in Shakespeare or Tolstoi or William James. And one may be pardoned for suspecting that the loose-jointedness of the world-picture given by these great thinkers may be after all less a matter of principle than of deferred enquiry, due to the immense descriptive burden under which even their encyclopædic minds now and then visibly staggered. Realism had not yet become a conscious philosophic type: it required the shock of modern idealism to pull it into self-awareness and self-definition.

205. *Modern realism.* Since idealism burst upon the modern world in its subjective form, modern realism first took shape as a polemic against subjective idealism. And since this idealism came in the form of a new intuition, namely, what we have called the 'subjective revelation,' realistic resistance naturally first took the form of insisting on opposing intuitions. This was Dr. Johnson's method,—the foot-stamping episode was simply a case of *intuition versus intuition*, a perfectly legitimate way of expressing one's lack of confidence in the adversary's logic, while waiting for one's own belated logical artillery to come up!

Thomas Reid (1710–1796, founder of the Scottish School) built a system of philosophy about

a group of such intuitions, which he called the "principles of common sense."* But there has never been a clearer or more persuasive statement of anti-subjective intuitions than by Professor Whitehead in his recent book, Science and the Modern World. For him, they are these: (1) that I am in the world, and not the world in me; (2) that the world extends far beyond my ken, and that it existed a long time before I appeared; and (3) that my physical activity intends to find and affect a real world beyond myself.† To which we may add a fourth conviction, not precisely intuitive but belonging to common sense,—that what is true for me and for others like me is presumably true for all of us together, namely that the world of nature extends beyond the mental reach of the whole conscious family of minds.

According to idealism, there could have been nothing in the world before mind appeared: for there never was a time when there was not some mind, and without that mind nothing else could exist. For the same reason, nothing could exist wholly unknown,—no stray disconnected fragments of being, gradually encountered and picked up by the central organizing focus of history,—no undiscovered matter or energy eternally exist-

* Enquiry into the human mind on the principles of common sense, 1764.

† Pp. 125 f. This third intuition is evidently the meaning of Dr. Johnson's attack on the stone. I regard it as one of the great merits of Professor Whitehead's book that he thus recognizes and reaffirms the intuitive element in the realistic view.

ing on its own account. As the realist sees it, an object can perfectly well exist without being known; to any object, it is a pure accident whether it ever becomes known. And if all mentality in the world could be obliterated, there would be many things in the world—perhaps most things—to which that event would make no manner of difference. If there have always been minds alive in the world, that is a pure matter of fact; in principle it would be quite possible to conceive the universe as existing forever without any mind to know it; and with all the mentality now alive much of the universe may still remain forever unknown to any mind. So far, realism would be in full accord with naturalism, and both would be in the agreeable company of common sense as against the idealistic paradox.

206. But realism is rationalistic, and recognizes that these metaphysical intuitions, if they are to hold their own, must be sustained by logical argument against the logic of idealism. It must find the weak point in idealistic armor, and set up an opposing theory of knowledge. This was what Thomas Reid essayed to do. He thought he had found the root error of idealism in the theory of Descartes, "that all the objects of my knowledge are ideas in my own mind." Against this he pointed out that *knowledge reaches beyond our minds:* for knowing is something more than having ideas and

impressions,—knowing is *judging*, and judging is referring an experience to an object beyond oneself. I *have* the sensation red light; I *judge* that there is a fire: the sensation may be my idea, but the act of knowing refers this idea to a non-mental reality.

This was a good preliminary analysis of the subjectivist's error, and a good beginning of cure; but Reid was hardly logician enough to carry his theory through. Thus his school stands chiefly as a school of protest, waiting for the appearance of more skilful and persistent reasoners. It remained for the group known as *neo-realists*, whose work begins with the opening of the twentieth century, a group chiefly of American and British thinkers, to work these beginnings out into coherent form, and to avoid the pitfalls into which naturalism and the naïver forms of realism had fallen.

Chapter XXVIII

NEO-REALISM

207. As compared with traditional realism, contemporary realism has one disadvantage and one advantage. Its disadvantage is that, having a prevalent idealism to contend with, it is preoccupied with polemic; its chief concern seems superficially to be a negative one, that of disproving the logic whereby the idealist makes a world of objects depend on a world of mind. Its advantage is that it arises at a time when logic is making rapid advances and places new instruments of precise thinking in our hands. Hence, again superficially, there has appeared to be a natural alliance between modern realism and modern logic. But with these new instruments, neo-realism has been able to make a strong case for three propositions critical of idealism, two of which we readily identify with the fundamental theses of traditional realism:

1. The objects of knowledge do not depend on the mind for their existence;
2. The world is many and not one: it is analysis which leads us most surely to reality;
3. The doctrine of monism is in one respect meaningless; in another respect immoral, since

it proposes to merge the evil of the world into the same being with the good.

We shall consider each of these positions in turn.

208. *The first proposition:* the objects of knowledge do not depend upon the mind for their existence.

This proposition the neo-realist usually approaches by an analysis of perception, in order to show (as Reid tried to show) the nature of the error into which Descartes and Berkeley fell, and with them the whole idealistic structure. The trouble, as neo-realism sees it, is in the common idealistic assumption that perceptions belong somehow exclusively to the perceiving mind, an assumption embodied in calling them 'ideas,' whereas it remains logically possible that they may belong *both* to the mind and to the things in nature, or perhaps not at all to the mind and altogether to the things. Because we always find objects as things-observed-by-us, or as things-thought-of-by-us, it is easy, but fallacious, to conclude that it is essential to them to be in that relation.* The fact that owing to our "ego-centric predicament"

* The whole of Professor Perry's searching examination of idealistic logic (Present Philosophical Tendencies, Part III), though rather technical for a beginner, will reward any reader who enjoys keen analysis and apt expression. His criticism of the argument from the ego-centric predicament we have already considered (§§ 160, 161). The gist of other fallacies, named by him the fallacies of "exclusive particularity" and of "defining by initial prediction," is somewhat crudely summarized in the above paragraph.

we can never find an object without a subject, has no force whatever in meeting the question whether an object can *exist* without a subject: the disability is ours, not the object's. We sometimes meet in idealistic writings the remark that the world and the things in it are "fitted to be known": according to Berkeley, it is a "repugnancy" that a perception should exist out of relation to some perceiver. But has this quality of being "fitted for knowledge" any meaning? The human hand is a specific something to which other specific things, like jug handles, can be fitted; but knowledge is no such specific thing. Nothing can be *unfitted* to be known; for knowledge is so hospitable and undemanding as to receive (either through sense or through idea) everything that exists. Hence the fact that we know, or think of, a thing implies exactly nothing about its character, or its capacity for independent existence.

But we have further a positive reason for assuming that in the usual order of things, objects first exist and then become known. For to know means to recognize what is *there* apart from knowledge. The idealist seems to propose that the mind somehow produces its own objects; but this is impossible,—knowledge can not make its objects, nor transform them, nor in any way alter them. If knowledge changed its object, it would not be knowledge, but illusion; for it is the business of knowing to report things as they are. Still

more if knowledge were supposed to make its objects would it fail of its mission: it does not make them,—it finds them!

209. Let us be clear about this. Neo-realism is quite serious in proposing, with naïve common sense, that in perceiving objects we are finding them just as they are apart from perception. To be consistent, then—and we shall have to insist a little on consistency in portraying a neo-realistic type, for these writers differ among themselves—knowledge must be a peculiarly harmless and transparent relationship: objects can happen into it, i. e., they can become known, as snowflakes may drift through a beam of light without undergoing significant change. The process of knowing—if it is a process—hardly seems to be an activity, for the object is simply *there* before us: it is 'present' and we are effortlessly taking note of it. If there is any act, it is at most an act of referring to, or intending, or attending to the object: we focus our eyes, but this does not determine what we shall see. Thus knowing does not 'constitute' the object, nor 'take it into the mind,' nor make it 'an idea': it rather leaps beyond the mind toward what is outside it: it is a relationship which acknowledges, but does not claim.

But one consequence of this conception of knowing is that we shall have to *abandon the cause-and-effect account of perception* given by

naturalism, root and branch. That is, we shall have to give up the theory that perception arises as the result of certain effects on our nervous systems whose causes proceed from the object and its environment. For by this theory, as we have seen, the perception is numerically different from the object (§151); and further, since the brain effect has no recognizable resemblance to the object, the percept thereupon instigated is actually created by the mind,—and we land full in subjectivism, the thing to be shunned at all costs! If perception is the identical *presence* of the object, it can simply not be an *effect* of the object*; and here neo-realism begins perforce to part company with naturalism, and, in so far as naturalism builds its view of perception on physics and physiology, with science itself.

* Neo-realists who attempt to hold to the physiological account of perception, like R. B. Perry and W. P. Montague, are necessarily rendered uncomfortable by this situation, which they themselves very clearly express in referring to the fact "that no external happening can be perceived until after it has ceased to exist" (The New Realism, p. 3): it is not merely that there is a temporal and spatial and qualitative "aberration" of the percept from the object, but that it is existentially a wholly new and different fact. An attempt is made to escape this consequence by assuming that we perceive the past object itself (for objects of memory like objects of perception must, in all realistic consistency, be independent of our remembering them; there is thus no obstacle to considering that we perceive what is not actually existing). The object causally stirs the *act* of apprehension; which act thereupon *finds* the object. This is a useless evasion. The image of the object as apprehended exists now (and is thus of course wholly different from a memory-object); the object in its physical context does not now exist. That image is not that object. Perry seems to reach the only possible conclusion, namely that physical science must be abandoned at this point, when he says (Philosophy of the Recent Past, 199) that sense-perception is not an effect, but "an act in which the object is given or disclosed."

210. Note another remarkable consequence. We are spared the necessity of believing that the 'secondary qualities' of things, their colors, odors, etc., exist in the mind, while the real objects possess only the 'primary qualities' (§145). This ungracious divorce of the qualities of nature from her quantities (the 'bifurcation of nature' as Professor Whitehead calls it) is repudiated. Berkeley got rid of this unnatural separation by taking both primary and secondary qualities into his fabric of 'ideas'; neo-realism gets rid of it by allowing both of them independent extra-mental reality. The color of the sunset is not due to the eye, nor the sound of Niagara to the ear, nor the warmth of the fire to the sense-organs of the skin. These qualities are in nature, just as they seem to be. We might say that they are in the objects, or belong to the objects, but most realists would prefer to say that the object is simply an assemblage of these qualities.

For neo-realists as a group agree entirely with Berkeley that there is no material 'substance.' Here they make use of the idealistic analysis, and depart most radically from traditional realism from Aristotle to Thomas Reid. "The principle of substance," says Professor Perry, "betrays realism into the hands of its enemy."* For if we

* The New Realism, p. 103. A dissenting group of realists, the Critical Realists, demonstrated that this fear is well-founded; for maintaining the tradition of an extra-mental substance, they allow that sense-qualities are subjective appearances. They deviate from

say that the extra-mental thing to which knowledge refers as its object is the 'substance' of things, the qualities remain in an uncertain half-way status between the mind and the external substance, in danger of capture by the mind if only because this mysterious 'substance,' so elusive in itself, is equally obscure in its hold upon 'its' properties. Hence neo-realism discards substance, and—as Perry goes on to say—"is in sympathy with the whole modern trend of thought (since Berkeley and Hume) toward identifying reality with the elements, processes, and systems of experience." After all, the concept of substance seems to have been used chiefly as a mark of emphasis whereby the mind repudiates the ownership of the objects presented in experience: to say, These things are substances, means simply These things do not belong to *me*, but to something else, or possibly to themselves! Neo-realism accepts this meaning, and dismisses the superfluous concept: it is these very qualities and not anything behind them,—it is "the sensible and intelligible properties of things," which are to be understood as existing by and for themselves in independence of being known.

211. It begins to appear that the realist is trying to walk a rather narrow plank. The fire is

neo-realism in the direction of Kant's theory of knowledge. They are thus less typical than the neo-realists, and we regretfully omit the discussion of their views.

surely hot; but we find it a little hard to believe that it feels hot to itself* in the same way that it feels hot to us: the warmth as an experience would seem to belong to the mind. Naturalism itself would require this interpretation of the feeling of warmth; and we note in passing that neo-realism having dissociated itself from science is now clear of naturalism also.

Allow, then, that the color, the shape, the sound, the warmth exist as qualities in nature, not dependent on being perceived by us or by any other mind. What now shall we do with dreams, mirages, illusions, hallucinations, errors of judgment? Are these 'unreal' objects also 'there' and independent of being thought of? And what shall we do with objects which we usually regard as objects of thought *par excellence*, namely, mathematical conceptions, numbers, perfect circles, logical rules, hypotheses, our tentative and variable 'ideas' about what natural law is,—all the abstractions of reason, the world of 'universals'? Common sense would say, these at least are mental.

But if we allow these to be mental, we compromise the independence we have already granted to the objects of sense-perception. For these

* The realist will object to this phrase, and rightly in so far as feeling implies apperception. But reduce feeling to the 'given', and I think we have what *must be meant*. Show me in what other way heat can exist than (1) molecular vibration in space or (2) feeling, and I will change the phrase.

thought-objects mingle with them, and are inseparable from them. It would be impossible to draw a line between sense-objects and thought-objects without creating another bifurcation, as objectionable as that between the primary and the secondary qualities. Neo-realism, therefore, takes the courage of its convictions and accepts the unplausible alternative: all these objects are likewise independent of being thought about.

The truths of logic and of mathematics certainly remain valid whether any one thinks of them or not. If the perfect circles, straight lines and the like together with the eternal truths about them do not exist in nature, they may *be assigned to a realm of their own*, a realm of 'subsistence,' where our thoughts may find them without pretending to create them.

212. Here neo-realism may claim the support not alone of its own logic, but of a notable strand of the history of thought which we have not hitherto noticed, likewise called 'realism,' and hailing not from Aristotle but from Plato. For to Plato, the 'ideas,' as the universal perfect prototypes of defective particular things (§111) are real; and this reality implies that they have an eternal and changeless being, not only in independence of the material stuff which takes on their semblance, but also (Plato seems to say) in independence of any mind which thinks them. Existence in time and

space is certainly not their way of being; for the particular things in time and space are transitory; nor yet do they depend on our thinking them, for we also come and go: they have a different mode of being to which the questions where, when and how do not apply, and which can best be indicated by a figure such as Plato resorts to when speaking of the ideal city:

> I understand; you speak of that city of which we are the founders, and which exists in idea only; for I do not think that there is such a one anywhere on earth?
>
> In heaven, I replied, there is laid up a pattern of such a city, and he who desires may behold this, and beholding govern himself accordingly.*

This thought of Plato's found a strong echo in various mediæval philosophers, impressed by the absolute claims of logic upon the human mind. There was evidently a realm of universals having an order of its own which we neither determine nor control, but obediently observe. The *genus*, including several species, was not alone logically 'higher' than the *species*, but of a higher degree of reality: the species is derived from the genus. Then the highest universal, Being, is the most real entity in the system, including them all and binding them all together. To some of these mediæval thinkers, this whole system of ideas, so far

* Republic, Book IX, 592.

as it had being apart from actual things, could only be conceived as existing in the mind of God, as his eternal thoughts. To others, the highest universal *is God;* or to put it conversely, God is no other than the highest of all universals, including in itself all the rest.

Modern realism is quite free from the theological preconceptions of the great scholastics, and would particularly repudiate the notion that the universals need the mind of God or any other mind to confer reality upon them. It finds itself more immediately at home in the Platonic world of thought, where the ideas 'subsist' in their own right.

213. It seems somewhat anomalous to intrude into this realm of perfect and eternal order those other objects of mental vision,—dream, fancy and mistake. Yet they must not be taken into the mind. Are not they 'objective' in the same sense that actual things are? The monster that pursues me during a nightmare is not of my intentional fabrication, otherwise I would have an end of him; and the scenery of my dream is of such detail as I would be at a loss to paint, if I were commissioned to do it. It is not my deliberate self who produces this concrete environment. Shall we then assume another region or regions for these illusory objects, which are certainly not 'eternal' like the circles or numbers; and say of them, with Pro-

fessor Holt, that "unreality is no more subjective than reality; for a thing may be objective and yet unreal"?*

To an uninstructed mind a vivid dream may be taken, not for a 'mental' experience, but for an actual excursion into another world. But even a savage ordinarily ascribes a mistake to himself; and to more sophisticated minds, error and dream alike are distinctively 'my' ideas. Charles Peirce goes so far as to say that it is chiefly through error and ignorance—which must be ascribed to something—that one gets an idea of himself in the first place. In any case, for common sense and for philosophy alike, it would seem that if the word 'subjective' is to mean anything it must apply to these private and unsharable visions which mislead my judgments of the 'objective' facts.

But common sense can be no final criterion of truth. If neo-realism is to be thorough with the view that the objects of mind are not mental, it must make up its mind to part company here with common sense whose friendship it could claim at first with such good effect. From the difficulty we have here reached we can infer only, at present, that realism needs much ingenuity to make out a plausible theory of error † This brings no dismay to the neo-realist: ingenuity is his leading

* The New Realism, 367.

† The fifth and sixth essays in The New Realism, by Professor Montague and Professor Holt respectively, are devoted to this enquiry.

characteristic. For neo-realism is a subtle philosophy. It is rather striking that beginning as it does in a sturdy alliance with common sense against idealistic paradox, it ends by being peculiarly a professional development of philosophy, the most unplausible of all modern philosophical inventions. It pays the penalty, moreover, of all intricacy in philosophy: its members reach vastly divergent results, and we cannot follow them into these, as yet unfinished, developments. We have traced as far as we may the bearings of the first proposition, that the objects of knowledge do not depend on the mind for their existence.

214. *The second proposition:* The world is many and not one; it is analysis which leads us most surely to reality.

The reader will have observed that the arguments of realism under the first proposition affect only the subjective form of idealism. There are few idealists to-day who would say that "things owe their existence to being known." Most of them would say that "things owe their existence to being *willed*," or that they owe it to their value or meaning; and they would add that the source of the existence of natural objects is certainly not the will of the finite human knowers. To the objective idealist, most human knowing, all 'empirical' knowing, is receptive rather than productive or creative, and he would agree with the

contention of realism that we know what is beyond ourselves. In so far, then, as the realist confines himself to refuting the proposition that "things owe their existence to being known" he does little damage to idealism.

But objective idealism requires that the world be conceived as a unity; and that this unity, which is mental, shall be understood as the original source of the many things in the world, not as built up by these many things into a compound which is *their* product. If the second proposition of neo-realism is true, objective idealism becomes untenable.

215. Now analysis in physics discovers molecules, atoms, electrons:—these according to the realist, and the common convictions of science, come successively closer to reality. We are nearer the truth when we think of a gas as composed of separate molecules than when we think of it as a continuous fluid; and still nearer the truth when we carry our mental microscope to the last frontier of minute dissection. Likewise in biology one may analyze an organism into cells; and in psychology, the mind may be analyzed into sensations or minute shocks of experience.* Are these units also nearer the reality than the whole organism or mind taken as a unit? The realist fears that we are continually misled by what appears

* Holt in agreement with Spencer, The New Realism, 351.

simple to our apprehension,—the fallacy of "pseudo-simplicity";* and that the idealist is especially the victim of this fallacy when he assumes that the self or mind can be taken as an original unity.

216. Now the idealist has been prone to make much of the fact that analysis discovers something else beside the elements, namely, their *relations* to each other, their types of connection, their modes of interaction which we call 'laws.' These arrangements and laws have a reality of their own; they are not nothing. The space in which atoms play is not nothing. The attraction or repulsion which one atom has for another is an important part of what an atom *is*. Two atoms whose essence it is to attract one another are not two separate things, but two members of a single thing. (And since everything in the universe is related to everything else, the universe is ultimately one being.)

To this the realist replies that we must distinguish between *two types of relationship*. There are relations which are an integral part of the being of an element; there are others which are so far accidental that they may come and go without making any difference to the element. A molecule of gas may be taken away from the other molecules and remain (approximately) the same molecule; a cell cannot be taken away from the other

* The New Realism, p. 13.

cells of an organism and remain the same cell. Its 'life,' we say, goes out of it. In other words, it is a part of the being of a cell to be in an organism: its relations to its neighboring cells are called 'internal' relations, because they make up a part of what the cell is. The relations of a molecule to a molecule, or still better, of a brick to a brick, are called 'external'; because it is indifferent to the being of the brick whether it is or is not with other bricks. The neo-realist does not deny that all things in the universe are related—this is what makes them a universe; nor that relations are real—he asserts this. But he maintains that many relations are purely external,—especially those frame-relations which might tie the universe together, such as the relation between thought and its objects,—so that what we have is a group of independent entities, independently related,—an ultimate plurality of reals.

217. This being the case, we must understand the world from the parts to the whole, not from the whole to the parts; and whatever *the mind* is, it must await the results of analysis to determine whether it can pose as anything original and simple or whether it must be regarded as a composite of numerous simple elements. On the face of it, the realist is disposed to accept the naturalistic evidence that mind does not occur until we have organisms with nervous systems; and what results

from such an assemblage of non-mental reals is presumably itself composite and not simple.

A satisfactory analysis of the mind must be regarded as a piece of unfinished business for neo-realism,—which is, after all, a very young movement as philosophical movements go. But there are already in existence various bold sketches of such an analysis, none bolder, nor in principle simpler, than that of Holt given in The Concept of Consciousness.*

The mind for Holt reduces to a complex of elements,—let us say, sensations. But these sense-elements do not 'belong' to the mind. They are at the same time elements of physical objects. Just as the square at a cross-roads belongs to both roads and to neither, so these elements of sense-stuff may be reckoned as part of a mind or part of nature according to the way they are linked up with other such elements. In themselves they are '*neutral entities*.' When they enter into causal relations with others, they constitute the world of nature; when they are combined in the order we call memory-continuity, they constitute minds.

This explains why knowing does not make its objects, and why it is such a transparent sort of relationship to the objects. For there is no knower aside from these objects and their interplay, and therefore no relation of the knower to the known,

* See also The New Realism, 372 f. This theory was proposed by William James in an article "Does Consciousness Exist?" September 1, 1904, reprinted in Essays in Radical Empiricism.

no 'conscious-ness' as a distinct entity in the world: the mind and the knowing process are just the play of these neutral entities upon each other in the memory-order. The mind is a selection, at any time, from all of the infinitely numerous neutral-entities of the world,—a selection determined by the capacity of some nervous system to react to its environment. And dreams, fancies, erroneous judgments are just so much good neutral stuff—shreds of imagery, let us say—which do not happen to connect with other neutrals in the order of causation.

The mind, itself, being a relatively unstable and transient union of elements which are relatively permanent, is thus seen to be eminently unfitted to be the substantial creative principle of the universe.

218. *Third proposition:* the proposed idealistic unity of the world is in one respect meaningless; in another respect immoral, since it proposes to merge the evil of the world into the same being with the good.

It is meaningless: for whatever can be said of all things can logically make no difference to anything. Mind as we find it in the world is in contrast to things that are non-mental, and gets its distinctive meaning by this contrast. When we try to make mind the substance of everything, we lose this contrast, and therefore the significance of the

proposition. The reference of everything to 'mind' becomes in the end tedious and unprofitable; the more so since we can never be quite sure what an absolute and all-inclusive mind would be like.

It is immoral; since it must assume that in the absolute mind good and evil, which are present in the world on equal terms, are reconciled or made consistent with each other. If the absolute mind is held to be all-good, then the evil of the world must be an illusory appearance which vanishes from the absolute point of view,—and from ours, in proportion as we succeed in attaining that outlook. This to the realist is an encouragement to indifference and moral laxity; an apology for the abominable. "There is always one remaining philosophy," says Spaulding,* "that allows evil to stand at its full face value, and that finds all methods of arguing it out of existence to be invalid. . . . Evil is evil, and it cannot be transformed or argued out of existence."

The absolute mind, if there is such a thing, evidently co-exists with the present mixture of good and evil in concrete affairs: and if so, how can its existence furnish guarantee or ground for hope that the future will be any better? The absolute under the guise of mind must be morally as indifferent as if under the guise of matter: it lies in the nature of everything which aspires to be all things, that it cannot be partial to any side; yet

* Prof. E. G. Spaulding, What Am I, p. 255.

the moral life demands such partisanship! This view of the case realism shares with pragmatism, and particularly with William James, who summoned courage to defy the conception of the Absolute as "a metaphysical monster." (Varieties of Religious Experience, 447; see also The Letters of William James, p. 135.)

So much for the realistic position and its polemic against idealism.

Chapter XXIX

REALISM EXAMINED

219. Realism is a system of thought which presents itself to us with the strange but candid admission that it is incapable of being tested. It necessarily accepts the fact that in the nature of the case no object independent of thought can be found or thought of. It can only urge us not to build hasty inferences on what may after all be a mere incident of our ego-centric mode of knowing.

It does indeed propose to analyze the process of perception, and professes to find that the object perceived is independent of the perceiver, meaning thereby not 'out of relation' to the perceiver but out of any relation which would imply dependence on the perceiver for existence,* such as being then and there caused or created by the perceiver. And the realist is undoubtedly right when he reports that we do not find ourselves in perception creating our own objects. But this does not prove what he needs. For (in order to be sure that there is not some kind of dependence he hasn't thought of) he would have to show that the perceived object is capable of existing apart from the mind. And this he could only do by a physical or mental experiment, such as trying whether we

* The New Realism, 117.

can conceive objects as existing apart from all thought, an experiment manifestly incapable of execution, though foolishly countenanced by no less a thinker than David Hume! Analysis cannot show that the object is independent of (or externally related to) the knower:* it can only indicate that dependence is, in its judgment, not as yet made out.

What grounds, then, does realism offer us? Essentially three. First, a revulsion against the ineptitudes of idealistic argument. Second, those intuitions of common sense to which, it is alleged, idealism does not do justice. Third, the possibility of making a consistent theory of the world on other than idealist assumptions.

220. These grounds are all pertinent, so far as they can be established. As to the third of them, I shall undertake to show that it lends no support to realism in any present form, inasmuch as no consistent realistic system is yet forthcoming. The first and second grounds are more substantial. A revulsion against damned iteration of any form of philosophic cant is significant:—wherever there is feeling, we have said, there is cognition; and this particular feeling amounts to an intuition

* As collateral evidence for this proposition, note that such springs of realism as we find in Brentano, Meinong, Husserl rest the independence of the object on an 'intention' of the mind; while Alexander bases it on a 'conviction,' Santayana on animal faith, etc., and most American realists are satisfied with the absence of a proof of dependence.

that idealism, as at present professed, has been taking its results too easily. The first ground thus merges with the second; and we have the interesting situation that a type of philosophy which prides itself particularly on its rationality is chiefly recommended by intuitions,—the intuitions which determine its revolt against idealism (§192).

To my mind the most important element in neo-realism is what we might call its philosophical atavism, that is, its reversion to naïve views of the world of objects, in order to see what can be made of a re-shuffle of racial intuitions. Try the assumption that objects exist when we are not looking, just as we see them. Try the assumption that there is no bifurcation in nature. Try the assumption that mind is in a greater world, and not the world in any mind. Try thinking of the world as a lot of independent reals. Allow, with Perry, that "the human mind is instinctively and habitually realistic, so that realism does not so much need to be proved as to be defended against criticism,"* —a most fortunate thing, if true, for a system which can offer no proof. Take these as your postulates and see what you can make of them. This is the essence of neo-realism, an invigorating experiment in re-interpreting experience.

221. Of course, these intuitions, like all other

* Philosophy of the Recent Past, 201.

intuitions, need themselves to be interpreted. We ought not let pass without scrutiny the general impression just noted that the instinct of the human mind is clearly realistic:—we recall that Berkeley thought he was speaking for the common man against the philosophers! What does the intuition of common sense say about independent objects?

Chiefly this, I think: that I can change objects without substantially altering myself, and that the objects can change observers without themselves being altered. When I am attending to a brick wall or a tree, I am not expressly attending to myself; hence when my attention flits from the brick wall to the tree, I am not observing any change in my 'self,'—*self being a constant in the flux of sense-objects*, something I carry around with me. Likewise when I cease attending to the brick wall and another observer takes my place, he sees what I saw; *the brick wall being a constant in the flux of observers.* Thus the observers and the walls are relatively independent. But there are two things common sense does not say. It does not report that when I attend to myself I have no physical object at all in the field,—for this is not true: I can dispense with any particular physical object, and still be myself, but *not with all* of them, not with 'nature.' Nor does it report that the physical object which can dispense with my mind or yours can dispense *with all minds*, and

still be itself: on this point, which is the point at issue, common sense has nothing to say.

But there is one intuition which bears on this point. It is mentioned by Professor Whitehead as an additional reason against subjectivism. "I do not understand," he says,* "how a common world of thought can be established in the absence of a common world of sense." This common world of thought he assumes we have; for do we not converse? But why not appeal at once to the intuition *that our world of sense is a common world?* For surely we all take this for granted. The same brick wall may be seen by a multitude of observers, not alone successively, but at the same time. I do not so much as need to see these other observers to know that the wall is thus sharable. How do I know this? It goes with what I mean by the 'objectivity' of the wall: it is not subjectively mine, because it is in the nature of the thing to be observable-by-many. If this is common sense—and I believe it is—then common sense does say with realism that in knowing I reach beyond myself,—the object is independent of *me;* but it also says that in getting beyond myself I get into a world in which mind other than my own has an established concern,—and this is no longer distinctively realism. Objective idealism comes nearer to common sense at this point.†

* Science and the Modern World, 126 (1st ed.).

† It remains logically possible that the object is capable of belonging to many minds because it first belongs to itself alone: that is the

If then we appeal to intuition alone to decide this issue, it would give no unequivocal verdict for realism. But we are committed at present to entertaining the realistic alternative, and to considering it, not on its intuitive, but on its logical merits.

222. Is the realistic analysis of perception valid?

With all the realistic disproof of subjectivism, the objective idealist need find no fault,—if only it were based on a true analysis. He too builds on the fact that in empirical knowledge the mind is reaching beyond itself; and regrets (in the interest of enlightening philosophical argument) the

doctrine of realism. But the intuitions of common sense cannot be appealed to as favoring this view. For what we have on the surface of experience as we spontaneously take it are two aspects of the objectivity of the wall, *either of which can be inferred from the other.* Assume that the object is independent, belonging to itself alone (or to nature apart from all minds), and it follows that it will be open to all observers on the same terms, if it is open to any. Assume, on the other hand, that the object is primarily a common term in many minds, and it will follow that it must appear relatively independent of any of them, as the hub of a wheel in rapid motion seems to exist in independence of its spokes though it may be cast in one piece with them. As between these alternatives, common sense does not trouble to decide; though the realist has still to make out that any one knows by intuition or otherwise what is meant by an unperceived physical object in the full glory of its secondary qualities.

And there is still a third alternative, to which I, for my part, subscribe. Namely, that no empirical knower, and no group of empirical knowers, can supply all the necessary conditions for the presence of any physical object in experience: the object being, in its substance, 'given' to all such knowers. But it is not given by a physical world: it is given by an active will, which intends to communicate that experience. On this view, the object has a certain being in independence of all mere observers, yet its being is not a dead and absolute fact which somehow bursts into a mysterious relation of being known. This view seems to me the only one fully just to our native intuitions. All empirical knowers know realistically, as knowing beyond themselves; but they know nothing independent of all mind. Nor is there any such thing.

tendency of various realists to define idealism by the formula "To be is to be known,"—a formula which Berkeley himself corrected.* But we cannot agree with this analysis, according to which, in ordinary sense-perception, knowing is an inactive relation wherein an independent object is simply disclosed.

The activity of a mental factor in determining what we perceive is too evident a fact to be denied (§165, above): the simple *presence* of colors and shapes is not knowledge,—nothing is known unless it is *judged* (as, This object ten feet ahead is a brick wall), and judging is an action. Experiencing is getting answers to questions which the mind is putting to the world: if there is no questioning activity, there is no knowledge,—the brick wall itself for a totally unquestioning mind is not there! For the completely absent-minded person the wall begins to exist only when he begins to ask the question why he can get no farther along that line.

* Professor Whitehead does better justice to the idealistic position. He clearly states (Science and the Modern World, 127) that "The distinction between realism and idealism does not coincide with that between objectivism and subjectivism. Both realists and idealists can start from an objective standpoint. They may both agree that the world disclosed in sense-perception is a common world, transcending the individual percipient. But the objective idealist, when he comes to analyze what the reality of this world involves, finds that cognitive mentality is in some way inextricably concerned in every detail. This position the realist denies." But why *cognitive* mentality? To Fichte and to Royce, the knowledge is present, but is subsequent to the will: the reality of an object consists in its being willed, or being implied in something that is willed. In Schopenhauer's view there need not be a conscious will, and no will at all regarding details, nor knowledge of them; yet everything which exists exists because of will.

It is this activity which gives me both truth and error. Colors and shapes, as simply present facts, say nothing, and therefore cannot possibly be erroneous or illusory. And *I* can never be wrong if I confine my judging to noting, This color or shape is present to me. But if a spider on a window pane is taken to be a mile away and I seem to see a monster in the sky, there is an error; the error lies in my active contribution to what is there. I can be in error only if I act and because of my own act; the erroneous contents of my judgment are of my private fabrication. And I am equally acting if I truly judge the object to be on the window pane two feet away, and a spider. Knowing is never mere transparency: it is always doing something.

But does it change the object? And if so, is it not false to the meaning of knowing?

There is a confusion in this question. Suppose that something about the object, let us say, its color, exists only for an observing mind; so that the redness of the brick wall is no property of the brick wall taken by itself, nor yet of the combination sunlight—brick-wall—eye-and-brain, but of all this and a mind. Then, when I say, The brick wall is red, has my knowledge altered its object, and so falsified its own function? Not at all. For my judgment has nothing to say at that moment about the conditions which present the red color. The red color may be 'made by the mind,' if you

wish to put it in that elliptical fashion; but the *act of knowing* does not make it: that act is concerned not at all with the production of the color, but with the judgment. The color now present in that brick wall is red. It is therefore a false analysis which would infer from the subjectivity of sense qualities, if that were the case, to the self-stultification of knowledge.

And now note: the realist on his own principles cannot avoid the subjectivity of sense-qualities in the above sense, that the mind is a necessary condition for their appearance. For he believes that analysis leads us toward truth; and is therefore bound to accept the analysis offered by physics of the brick wall, the sunlight, and the eye-nerve-brain system. But to this analysis, light and all its properties are mathematical functions of simpler units, themselves unlighted. Reality is dark. And while qualities may be added, as the theory of emergent evolution suggests, with the various combinations of these ultimate reals, we have no right to assert any quality as 'there' until we find something happening in the world of events which calls for that quality. With this criterion, we become aware that many of those new qualities which emergent evolution recognizes at different stages are verifiably present only from our point of view: mind is *a necessary condition for their existence.* Then the realist is in the dilemma of having either to abandon his view that analysis is the

pathway to reality or to admit the bifurcation of nature. The real brick wall of physics is not the colored brick wall of my perception.

In nature as we find it, there is much which is due to the mind (not necessarily as knower but) as one term of that relation.

223. Then again, allowing for the sake of the argument that sense-qualities can be supposed to exist apart from any perceiver, and the warmth may be in the fire while the fire is out of every mind, what of the *general ideas* which enter into all my knowledge of natural fact?

We have just now declined to allow the realistic theory of error, on the ground that the erroneous contents of my judgment are demonstrably my own private production (§207).* We must also decline to admit that the 'universals' can either exist (as embodied in a world of physical laws and classes) or subsist (in an eternal realm of their own) in abstraction from every thinker.

The reasons for this are twofold: First (an elementary consideration; but since it is *the* consideration, we can't avoid mentioning it), a universal must be *thought* for the same reason as that a purpose must be *purposed*, or roughly for the same reason as that a frown must be frowned. The frown without the face will be allowed to be an ab-

* Holt and others would say "private selection" from the realm of universals or essences. The following argument deals with this mode of interpretation.

straction; and an abstraction is an object which ceases to be viable by itself when we cease thinking about it.

Second, if we allow any universals an independent existence, we must allow them all: and there are too many of them! Every conceivable idea must subsist in that realm; every shade of meaning being flanked by the next barely distinguishable shade, till as we consider it the whole mass fuses into a homogeneous plenum. With such a world of ideas our thought can do nothing.* It resembles a storehouse stuffed so full that no access can be had to anything; or better, a library of music containing all possible compositions written and unwritten, every combination of tones that can be made on any instrument, the very notion of a composition—which implies the rejection of innumerable possibilities—destroyed, an infinite resource rendered useless and meaningless by its unselective totality. Such an independent realm of universals or 'essences' appears to me, with all respect, as a piece of modern mythology without Plato's excuse, a striking instance of the extreme fancifulness which marks the irony of the realist's resolve to be supremely matter-of-fact.

William James objected to the absolute mind

*This pseudo-realm would include well-ordered series, like the series of real numbers, which while infinite have a known and usable law. But it must include, beside such series, all possible variations upon all possible objects from all possible points of view, that is, in all respects about which questions might be asked. But there is no such manifold as "all possible respects"; and such respects as there are imply the questioners.

that it contained too much, since it must be aware of every actual detail of the world, and why it is so and not otherwise, an endless "superfœtation of useless information."* If this be said of a mind, whose nature is selection, and which has only the actual world to consider, what shall we say of the realist's substitute for the absolute mind, the realm of eternal essences, which omits nothing?

224. *Is analysis the way to reach reality?*

The ultimate units which analysis finds are certainly not unreal. The realist is quite right in pointing out the absurdity of supposing that the more we think our way into the structure of things, the farther we get from final truth. The ultimate atoms, if we ever get to them, are undoubtedly things to reckon with! The question is, Are they self-sufficient and final?

If they were independent, self-existent beings, are we to accept with 'natural piety' the fact that there are so many of a kind, struck, so to speak, out of the same mould, and ask no further questions as to origin? The neo-realists have done little, so far, in cosmology; but what they have done takes the inevitable direction of referring these

* "Along with what everything is it must also be conscious of everything which it is not. . . . Furthermore, if it be a fact that certain ideas are silly, the absolute has to have already thought the silly ideas to establish them in silliness. The rubbish in its mind would thus appear easily to outweigh in amount the more desirable material. One would expect it fairly to burst with such obesity, plethora, and superfœtation of useless information." A Pluralistic Universe, 127 f.

multitudes of minute beings to some relatively simple generating process or auspices, like the primitive space-time of Professor Alexander.*

225. Realism is justified in rebelling against the notion that all relations are 'internal.' There are external relations, such as make no significant differences to their terms. All motion and exchange and substitution in the world are based on external relationships. The ship leaves port and ties up at another without ceasing to be the same ship, and without change in the docks.

But with every external relation, there is an internal relation. It is nothing to the brick that it lies beside or above another brick. But it is something to the brick that it is in space: and therewith has the possibility of being beside or above another brick. The external relation is a specification of an internal relation. These internal relations are inescapable, and unify the world.

226. If analysis is the way to reality, it must, in theory, lead us at last to objects ultimately simple and unanalyzable. And when we analyze the same thing in different ways, we should reach the same ultimate units. The mind, for example, being regarded as a combination of the same elements as those which make up physical nature—the neutral entities—should reveal to analysis the

* Space, Time and Deity.

same irreducible simples as are found by physics. Does it?

The ultimate simple for the mind must be something in the nature of sensation, a spot of color, a nervous shock. But these, if physics is right, are the outcome of processes highly complex. And a complex cause, we are told, cannot produce an absolutely simple effect. Shall we then revise our view that the spot of color is simple? Or shall we say that the simples of mental analysis are not the same as the simples of physical analysis?

Either alternative is embarrassing for realism; but in any case the second is inevitable. It is quite impossible to regard the ultimate units of physical analysis, say electrons, as in any sense elements of mentality. Thus, the view that the mind is a cross section of the world-collection of simple neutrals is hopelessly inconsistent with the doctrine of analysis as the revealer of reality.*

227. Under these circumstances, it might be advisable to abandon this conception of the mind. For, except Mr. Russell's, it is probably the most skeletal and eviscerated formula of human nature that has yet been put forward. And it has the additional disadvantage of being inconsistent with another fundamental principle of realism.

For the degree of independence which exists

* Dr. J. W. Miller, of Harvard, in view of this difficulty has devised a theory in which mental simples are superimposed on physical complexes.

between thought and its objects is best brought into evidence when we note, as above (§206), that the same self may have different objects and the same object different observers. That is, the self is something which remains substantially the same while the objects change. But if the self were a collection of objects, it would necessarily change as the objects changed. It could have no permanence except the relative permanence of the more persistent groups of independent objects, such as (for realism) the objects of memory and body-sensation. The only possibility of setting those objects free from mind is to recognize in the mind another sort of thing, such as the activities we were speaking of.

228. But it is also necessary to modify our trust in analysis. For there are objects in the world which are *both simple and complex*, simple from one point of view, complex from others. The spot of color may well be such an object. The mind itself is another. With such objects, analysis will give us part of the truth, but runs the danger of leaving out of account another part equally important. The false assumption in the theory of analysis is that simplicity is to be found *in one direction only*, the direction of the microscope. The simplicities of the world are presumably bipolar. It remains possible therefore that the entire universe, with many varieties of external relation

among its parts, much loose play and independence, has also its ultimate unity and simplicity.

229. *Is it true that the unity of all things, if there were such a unity, would be an indifferent and meaningless fact?* And, in particular, that the idealistic disposal of evil is immoral?

The realist is right in pointing out that no concrete problem is solved merely by the assertion that all is one in the Absolute. But it is a fair question, whether any one can avoid the acknowledgment of such unity; and whether it is not involved in realism itself. For the universals of the world, whether they form an independent realm, or whether they exist only as in the facts and as thought of, are at any rate a *system*, not a loose-strewn chaos. The genera do include the species; and there is a highest genus which includes them all. This highest universal may be lacking in differential connotation; but it cannot be meaningless, for it means whatever is included within it, namely, the universe.

This was the conclusion drawn by the great Platonic realists following Plato, such as Plotinus and Scotus Erigena, in the line of ancestry of neo-realism on one side of the house. From their realism of universals, they deduced a type of monism, which as we shall shortly see is called mysticism. These thinkers are of the same view with the neo-realists in their antipathy to such propositions as

All is mind; not because they wish to escape unity, but because they distrust hasty descriptives. The modern realist, when he is consistent with his own premises, will discover himself, if I am not mistaken, as a mystic in disguise. For the unity which logic requires in the realm of ideas is for him a metaphysical unity also.

230. The ethical difficulty remains. No doubt it is this question of the relation of good and evil in the world which chiefly leads the realist to distrust all philosophies referring to the Absolute or the One.

Realism accepts good and evil as distinct and opposing qualities, externally related to each other. Evil is evil and good is good. Good is to be made in the world, a human enterprise to be carried on by human effort and instruments. Evil is to be eradicated, not excused; and this battle is also a human responsibility. The method is scientific analysis, not prayer. The ethics of realism, so far as it has a distinctive ethics, is *humanism.*

Now no one can doubt that evil is evil. Nothing can be gained by calling evil illusory; for an illusion of evil is an evil illusion. The only question is whether evil is evil *and nothing else*, incurably external to all goodness; or whether it can also be something else, or a member of something else, and as such member change its character. Many evils we know to be thus transmuted by the whole to which they belong. Danger, for in-

stance, when an ingredient of adventure becomes a source of pleasurable excitement. A fright or a faux pas, when looked back on in memory, may be an occasion for laughter rather than pain. Transmutation is a fact of experience, not a theory; a fact which it would be absurd to call immoral.

Good and evil as objects of experience are the least independent of all objects; for they most sensitively change with every change in the experiencer. And since the experiencer is always changing with time, these qualities never stay precisely what they were. The chains are removed from Socrates' ankles; and as he rubs his shins he wonders whether there is any pleasure so great as the pleasure of relief. But a pain which one would willingly accept as the price of pleasure is no pure evil: it is evil and something else. "Call no man unhappy"—we might reverse the saying of Solon,—"until he is dead," i. e., until you know the end of his story.

But suppose you know the end of his story. And suppose the story closes, as many stories do close, on a retrospect and a present experience of misery or humiliation or injustice unrelieved. Suppose there is no further experience to transmute this evil. Then you have pure evil and nothing else. Thus the realist may point out that the transmut*ability* of evil is of no use in acquitting the universe, if it is not *in fact transmuted.*

However, we may reflect that, on realistic

grounds, one moment of time is not another. Analysis shows that they are separate. The past is past. If the quality of the present is externally related to the quality of the past moment, the death of any sufferer closes his account. His sufferings are over; and the past evil no longer exists as a debit against the universe. Wait until all the sufferers die, and the universe will have cured its own evil!

Murderer's logic, we say. The realist rejects it explicitly. It is he who has been holding this untransmuted evil up against the Absolute, as a moral debit, an evidence of the futility of the One. Thereby he is himself assuming a responsibility for past evil; he is accepting the past as a living part of the present. He is rejecting the atomic view of time, and making its parts into a moral continuity: the unity of his own mind is doing a work which he reproaches the Absolute for not doing. But in so doing he admits that the case of the untransmuted evils is a hopeless case *only if there is no absolute mind*, to create a moral continuity beyond the reach of human loyalty, and to ensure that the apparent end of the story is not final. It is only on realistic or naturalistic grounds that any such evil must remain untransmuted. This being the case, one could hardly say that the mental unity of the whole of history and of the world would be an insignificant fact if it were true, and certainly not an immoral fact.*

* This argument is given a more adequate statement in Journal of Religion, Nov., 1923, 582–589.

231. So the argument stands at present. I cannot reach the judgment that neo-realism has as yet supplied a consistent system of metaphysics. I do not believe that a consistent system can be built on the uncorrected principles of analysis, external relations, and the independence of object from subject.

Nevertheless, realism is performing a great service to philosophy. It has destroyed over-ease and over-simplicity in the idealistic outlook. It has proposed a variety of new alternatives. It has made emphatic the reach of knowledge beyond the self. It has called due attention to the actual complexity of the world, the prevalence of external relations, the futility of reiterating the reference of things to Mind without the heavy logical labor of showing *how* they are related thereto, and what difference it makes. It has broken up the indolent habit of solving philosophical problems by a uniform method, encouraging thinkers to take them individually and for their own sakes, as if the world had its local habits and a freedom of play between province and province. And the work of realism is not yet done.

And no doubt there will be a transfiguration of naturalism as one of its results. In attempting to take the world out of the mind, the realist will succeed in reading part of the mind into the world, its qualities and its universals. He fights idealism, as we have seen, in part with idealistic weapons:

he accepts the dismissal of material substance. The world composed of his 'neutral entities' cannot persist in its neutrality; it bears on its face a pertinence to experience; it is alive with the stuff that thought is made of.

The weakness of the realistic way of knowing is this: that in his preferential trust in analysis, the realist forgets that the human organ of knowledge is bi-focal, as befits a world in which the complex may be also simple. He has the right focus for the one, but not for the other. If there are characters of the universe which are hidden from the wise and prudent and revealed unto babes, the realist will not find them. The other focus is that of the mystic.

TYPE VII

MYSTICISM

CRITICS OF IDEALISM: (2) MYSTICISM

References

*Lao Tze. Tao Teh King (tr. Carus, Open Court).
Deussen. System of the Vedanta. (Outline, by J. H. Woods).
Al Ghazzali. Confessions (Wisdom of the East series).
Plotinus. Enneads.
Theologia Germanica, tr. S. Winkworth.
Dante. Vita Nuova, tr. D. G. Rossetti.
Spinoza. Ethics, Parts I and V.
Tagore, Devendranath. Autobiography.
*Tagore, Rabindranath. Sadhana (Essays 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 8).

**Discussions of mysticism*. Read one of the following:

James, William. Varieties of Religious Experience, Lectures XVI, XVII.
Hocking, W. E. The Meaning of God, Parts V and VI. Esp. ch. xxviii, The principle of alternation; which may be followed by chapters xxvi, xxiv, xxxii.
Bennett, C. A. A Philosophical Study of Mysticism.
Leuba, James. A Psychological Study of Mysticism.
Hügel, F. von. Mystical Element in Religion.

Literature of Mysticism

Underhill, E. Mysticism. Appendices give a good sketch of the vast literature of this subject.
Jones, Rufus M. Studies in Mystical Religion.
Enc. Brit. 13th ed. (New volumes, II, 1013), gives valuable references to recent literature.

Chapter XXX

MYSTICISM

All that is not One must ever
Suffer with the wound of Absence.
—Jelalu'd Din.

This, therefore, is the life of the Gods, and of divine and happy men, a liberation from all terrene concerns, and a flight of the alone to the Alone.—Plotinus.

232. The realist in us looks at things with analytical eyes: "As you believe in reason," he admonishes us, "you must believe in the results of reason,—the atoms or other plural elements of the world are its realities, they are independent of each other and of the knowers." The idealist, he believes, is too much of a monist; and he is such because he allows too little finality to the findings of analytical intelligence.

But the idealist has another critic within us who declares on the contrary that he, the idealist, *analyzes too much!* For he still distinguishes between himself and his objects, between himself and other selves, between the Great Self and all the finite selves of the universe. It is true, he is a monist; he believes that all the finite selves, and nature also, depend on the Great Self: but the finite selves are free, and value their independent separateness of being and action; and nature is a common object, distinct from all of them. Per-

haps the idealist is *not monistic enough;* and for the reason that he relies too exclusively on reason for the last word in his relationship with reality.

For we know that the kind of knowledge we call "objective" is in some respect imperfect: there is something arm's-length about it. The objective knowledge of charity "cases" may be entirely accurate without being entirely important: it may miss the heart of the matter. "Scientific management" will not make a man a good manager of men. Even intuition, which perceives the whole unique being of its living object with sympathetic intelligence, may still hold the object as something different from the one who knows it. Idealism—even with the intuitions which lead to it—leaves us unsatisfied, suffering "with the wound of Absence." There is, so to speak, another stage of intuition, in which the sense of other-ness drops away and the knower realizes that he is identical with the inner being of his object. At least, such is the view of our final type of philosophy, mysticism, which, in contrast with realism, teaches the *absolute unity of reality.* If reality is one, we can only know it truly when we merge with it; that is, when Knowing, in the 'objective' sense of Knowing *something not myself*, ceases.

"To see and to have seen that vision is reason no longer. It is more than reason, before reason, and after reason, as also is the vision which is seen. And perhaps we should not here speak of *sight:* for that

which is seen—if we must needs speak of seer and seen as two and not one—is not discerned by the seer, nor perceived by him *as a second thing*. . . . Therefore this vision is hard to tell of: for how can a man describe as other than himself that which, when he discerned it, seemed not other, but one with himself indeed?"*

Realism separates object and knower; idealism holds that all objects belong to some knower; mysticism holds that the objects and the knowers belong to each other,—they are the same reality, they are one.

233. On account of its common uses, the name 'mysticism' is more misleading than any other of our type-names. As a form of philosophy, mysticism is not to be associated with occultism or superstition, nor with psychical research, nor with an application of the fourth dimension to psychology, nor with a cult of vagueness, nor with a special love of the mysterious for its own sake.

Mysticism does indeed assert that after our best intellectual efforts there remains an element of mystery in reality: in this respect, mysticism is more allied to scepticism or agnosticism than to credulity. But the mystic, in the history of philosophy, is the *initiate*, one who has attained a direct vision of reality, a vision which he is unable to describe. Like the initiate in the old Greek mysteries, after the sacred drama has been shown to

* Plotinus, Enneads, VI, 9, §10.

him as a pictorial symbol of metaphysical truth, the mystic is silent not because he does not know, but because he cannot explain. (The word mysticism is related to the word "mum,"—the condition of one who knows but must not or cannot speak.)

We recognize his "way of knowing" here as that of the intuitionist, carried as we suggest to a further stage.* But in spite of the difficulty he finds in expressing his belief or his vision of reality, he seldom accepts the rule of complete silence which this situation would seem to require. Lao Tze, the Chinese mystic (500–600 B. C.?), draws this conclusion:

> One who knows does not talk.
> One who talks does not know.
> Therefore the sage keeps his mouth shut and his sense-gates closed. . . .
> The holy man abides by non-assertion in his affairs and conveys *by silence* his instruction. . . .
> To be taciturn is the natural way.†

Nevertheless, Lao Tze was persuaded to record his thoughts in a brief book, the famous Tao Teh King; and mystics have been unremitting in their efforts to express the inexpressible. The results are, as consistency would lead us to expect, enigmatic or paradoxical. Mystics frequently abound in the language of symbol or allegory to express

* Mysticism is, of course, in any case not the same as intuitionism; because it is more than a way of knowing: it is a definite metaphysical doctrine, and an ethics or way of life.

† Tao Teh King (Carus's translation), §§ 56, 3, 23.

what cannot be defined in strict conceptual form: so William Blake, Dante, Jacob Boehme (German mystic, 1575–1624), Dionysius the Areopagite (pseudonym of an unknown writer of about 300 A. D.). The immortality of many of these writings, as the Enneads of Plotinus or the cryptic Tao Teh King itself (new essays at translating this work into English are now appearing almost yearly) indicate that the mystic is not wrong in making these efforts. For in terms of our more mechanically conceived ideas, there no doubt *is* an element of paradox in experience; and the paradoxical statement, required to tell the truth about it, means something to the person who has himself observed it: the mystic can understand the mystic,—and, if I am right, there is an element of mysticism in all of us. And further, he can at least tell us what reality is not, as an indirect way of indicating what it is, thus:

"The Reason that can be reasoned is not the eternal Reason. The name that can be named is not the eternal Name. The Unnamable is of heaven and earth the beginning. . . .

"Thirty spokes unite in one axle; and on that which is non-existent—the hole in the axle—depends the wheel's utility. Clay is moulded into a vessel; and on that which is non-existent—its hollowness—depends the vessel's utility. By cutting out doors and windows we build a house; and on that which is non-existent—the space within—depends the house's utility. . . .

"We look at Tao (reality) and do not see it: it is colorless. We listen to Tao and do not hear it: it is soundless. We grope for Tao and do not grasp it: it is bodiless. . . . Forever and aye, Tao remains unnamable: and again and again it returns home to non-existence.

"The world's weakest overcomes the world's hardest (as water overcomes the rocks). Non-existence is at the heart of the impenetrable. Thereby I comprehend the advantage of non-assertion, and the lesson of silence. Tao always practises non-assertion; and there is nothing that remains undone."*

234. We may now form a summary picture of mysticism as a philosophy. It holds:

(1) That reality is One, an absolute unity, as against all atomistic or pluralistic metaphysical doctrines;

(2) That reality is ineffable (indescribable); whence, all the predicates or descriptives which we apply to it are somehow in need of correction,—including the predicates which now follow;

(3) That reality (as we seek it in the world outside of ourselves) is identical with the equally indescribable essence of the human self,—we may find reality, therefore, either by looking without or by looking within, and what we find in either case is the same, not merely alike in kind, but identically the same thing: the extremes coincide;

(4) That it is possible (and vitally important) to reach an intuitive knowledge of, or union with, this absolute One;

* Lao Tze, Tao Teh King, adapted from translation by Paul Carus.

(5) That the way to achieve this is by an effort which is primarily moral rather than theoretical.

In each of these respects, it is evident that mysticism is the precise counterpart of realism. The spirit of this type of metaphysics, in its 'mystical' identification of the outer reality and the inner reality, may be seen in this passage from one of the classics of ancient India:

"'Bring hither a fruit from yonder tree.'—'Here it is, venerable one.'—'What seest thou therein?'—'I see here, venerable one, very small seeds.'—'Divide one of them.'—'It is divided, venerable one.'—'What seest thou therein?'—'Nothing at all, venerable one.'—Then said he: 'the subtle essence which thou canst not perceive, from that truly has this great tree arisen. Believe me, dear one, that which is this subtle essence—of its being is the universe—that is the Real, that is the Soul,—*that art thou*, O Çvetaketu.'"

"'Here, put this piece of salt into water, and come back to me to-morrow.' He did so. Then said he: 'Bring me the salt which you put in water yesterday.'—He looked for it, but did not find it.—'Try on this side!—How does it taste?' 'Salt!'—'Try it in the middle!—How does it taste?'—'Salt!'—'Try on that side!—How does it taste?'—'Salt!'—'Leave it alone and sit down near me.' He did so, and he said: 'It exists still.'—Then said he: 'Truly, so also thou canst not perceive the Existent here (in the body) but it is nevertheless in it. That which is this subtle essence—of its being is this universe—that is the Real, that is the Soul,—*that art thou*, O Çvetaketu!'"

"If a man cuts this great tree at the root, it drips because it lives; if he cuts it in the middle, it drips

because it lives; if he cuts it at the top, it drips because it lives: it stands penetrated through and through by the living Self, exuberant and joyful. But if life leaves one bough, it withers. . . . Thus also shalt thou know, said he: this body certainly dies when the living one leaves it, but the living one does not die. That which is this subtle essence—of its being is the universe—that is the Real, that is the Soul,—*that art thou*, O Çvetaketu!" *

235. Mysticism has had a long history: it is older than realism, older than idealism. No age, not even our own, has been without notable representatives of this type.

While appearing in China, and reaching a high development in India (Brahmanism, Vedantism), it had a remarkable burst of popularity about the Mediterranean basin from the sixth century B. C. onward. We hear of the "mysteries" of various deities, of Osiris in Egypt, of Adonis in Syria, of Demeter, Dionysus, Orpheus in Greece, of Mithra in Persia and the Roman world. These mysteries were off-shoots of current religions; and were perhaps due to the break-up of great national religions in the political turmoils of the time, leaving the individual no longer able to identify his religious loyalty with his social loyalty, and giving him a strong motive to seek without reference to race, nation, sex or caste, a direct personal relation with reality in the form of an accessible deity, thereby winning moral stability in this life and a

* From Chândogya Upanishad vi. Deussen, System of the Vedanta, 265 f.

hope of personal immortality in another life. They had in common with philosophical mysticism chiefly this cult of personal union with the god, in states of enthusiasm, after moral preparation. There was much crudity, superstition and folly in these popular cults,—often downright barbarism. But the vital elements of the movement were so great as to command the interest of the greatest thinkers, as well as of the state. Athens established the Eleusinian mysteries as a public institution. Plato in his Dialogues made fun of the Orphics, and adopted certain of their ideas. Christianity in its early spread into Asia Minor found various mysteries in vogue; the theology of Paul is strongly influenced by that fact. The gospel of John is a mystical document: "I am the vine, ye are the branches . . . I and the Father are one." Plotinus, a disciple of Plato (204–270 A. D.) by the power of his thought and the nobility of his character lifted mysticism for the classical world into a clarified philosophical expression.

The influence of Plotinus was enormous. It spread, via the later Neo-Platonists—as his school is called—from Alexandria through the whole world of fading classical antiquity. It was transmitted to Arabic philosophy, and came to life again in a series of Mohammedan Persian mystics (Al Ghazzali, 1058–1111, who falling into scepticism, while teaching philosophy in Baghdad, abandoned his chair and his family, betook him-

self to asceticism, and ultimately reached a mystical philosophy). It influenced the Pseudo-Dionysius of whom we have spoken, who in turn became the progenitor of a long line of Christian mystics (John Scotus Erigena, Bernard of Clairvaux, Meister Eckhart, Tauler, Suso, Teresa, Nicolas of Cusa, Bruno, Silesius, Boehme, Dante, William Blake, Coleridge).

Spinoza and Schelling have much in common with mysticism in their doctrine that the One, the absolute substance, cannot be described, since all description is limitation (omnis determinatio est negatio). The absolute Being is beyond the distinctions of mind and matter, of good and evil, of finite and infinite, even of the numerical one and many.

Mysticism is evidently often the product of an intensely philosophical spirit discontented with the mere rationality of philosophy, and of an intensely religious spirit discontented with the dogmatic systems of theology in every creed. It is inspired by the insatiable ambition of individual spirits to know reality by direct acquaintance, rather than by rumor or description. Relying on the "inner light" rather than on tradition, it has a constant tendency to heterodoxy. It may produce the heretic, as Joan of Arc, as Bruno, as Spinoza. Or it may produce deviations within tradition, such as the "Quakers," the Pietists out of whom Kant came, the Anabaptists, ancestors of the Puritans.

In any case, the mystic's confidence that the divine principle is identical with himself, and that he may for himself gain direct access to ultimate truth, is well calculated to produce great and independent characters, as well as not a few fanatics and mystified spiritual wastrels. Our concern, however, is not with the failures. For if there had been but one genuine mystic in the course of history, a Mohammed, a Buddha, a Saint Francis, there would be, corresponding to that person, a true mysticism which would reward our utmost effort to recognize and distinguish it from its counterfeits.

Chapter XXXI

THEORETICAL MYSTICISM

236. Mysticism has two aspects, its metaphysics and its way of life, its theory and its practice.

Theoretical mysticism, the metaphysics of pure unity, is supported by all the considerations which, in the discussion of dualism, we were urging in favor of monism. But if this unity cannot be described, the corollary is that we ought not to call it either mental or material, either idealistic or naturalistic. This doctrine requires further study.

237. The great mystics, though relying on intuition for the final leap of knowledge, have commonly been keen reasoners. They have given something like a demonstration that the Real can have no attributes. They have used the same argument we found appealing to the realist (§218), namely, that what is true of all things cannot be a mark characteristic of anything. Every possible predicate, such as "great," excludes something, the "not-great." If then we say "The Real is great" we are denying that the Real can be small. But this limits the Real. The mystic is persuaded that the Real can be whole and entire in the mi-

nutest being, just as the salt-quality can be complete in every smallest drop of sea-water, or as one who is injured, however slightly, may truthfully say, "I am hurt,"—I, the whole Self, am identified with the part that is injured. The Real, then, cannot be called either great or not-great: these quantitative and relative ideas do not apply to it.

For the same reason, we could not call the Real good nor evil, nor a mixture of the two: it would be beyond the distinction of good and evil, this distinction being relative to our finite human point of view. It would likewise be beyond the distinction between mental and non-mental. It might fairly be said that the neutrality which the realist finds in his analytical elements of experience tends to reappear in the mystic's Unity,—a 'neutral entity' of cosmic proportions!

But if we are persistent in our logic, we shall remind ourselves that to describe the One as 'neutral,' or as 'cosmic,' or even as 'one' in the ordinary numerical sense would be to exclude from it the characters of 'non-neutral' and the like; for these too are descriptives. In all consistency, we should find ourselves reduced to silence! Are we not, in fact, reviving from another angle the considerations which led certain thinkers to agnosticism and the doctrine of the Unknowable? It is indeed true that the agnostic is, in this part of his philosophy, on ancient mystical ground: Kant and Herbert

Spencer are, in so far, mystics. But there are two or three remarks to make about this logic.

238. First, the mystic does not pretend to be neutral, *in the sense of indifference*, as between the various opposing predicates which we may try to attribute to the Real.

We may refrain from calling the Real 'good,' for fear of limiting it to our conceptions of goodness, and yet believe that 'good' comes *nearer the truth* than 'evil.'* And while hesitating to assert that the Real is 'mental' or 'personal'—for the mentality we know requires a non-mental environment to live and grow in, and the personality we know needs a society of other persons around it to play its very partial rôle in—the mystic still implies, when he identifies the Real outside us with the ultimate self within us, that 'mind' or 'spirit' would come nearer the truth than 'matter' or any non-mental thing. Thus, while mystics have commonly been in trouble with an orthodox tradition which insists on the literal personality of God, they have commonly referred to their Real as 'God.' And Spinoza, who maintained a stricter neutrality than most, used the expression 'Natura sive Deus,'—Nature *or* God.

239. Second, there is some reason for the mys-

* "The cause of all things is not any one of them. Hence it must not be called good in the sense of that good which it imparts to others. But in another sense it is *the good* itself, in a way transcending all other goods."—Plotinus, Ennead VI, 9, vi.

tic's judgment that it is more important to believe *that* the One exists than to know *what* it is like. To use a barbarous philosophical mode of speech, the 'That' is more important than the 'What,' in this case. Let me illustrate:

A recent novel represents a Mr. Fergus and a Mr. Saber playing at chess problems. Mr. Fergus has a notion that every man has a mission or purpose in this life imposed upon him by the universe: he does not in the least know what it is, but if he goes honestly ahead working toward it it will some day appear to him. He believes in the 'that' of his mission, without any 'what.' Saber is sceptical. He asks a pointed question:

"How can you work toward a purpose if you don't know what it is?"

Fergus answers: "How can you work toward a (chess) solution, if you don't know what it is?"

"Yes, but you know there *is* a solution."

"Well, there you are. And you know there *is* a purpose." The 'that' is enough to keep you going.

Other instances. Walter Bagehot, thinking of the formation of the first large national groups of men, said there was a time in history when it was more important that there should be law than that there should be good law. The mere 'that' of a law, recognized by all, helps a society to hold together; the 'what' of the law could be attended to after the authority of law itself was established. —In the conduct of battle, Scharnhorst's maxim

is frequently cited: In war it matters not so much *what* is done, as that something is done, and done with unity and strength.—If a person is freezing, it is of the utmost importance that he keep moving; what movements he makes is unimportant. Metropolitan police sometime distinguish in the same way between the 'that' and the 'what.'*

Suppose then that we could know, as the mystic says, that God exists, without knowing what God is. This would be a sort of middle ground between theism and atheism. The atheist says there is no God. The theist says, God exists, meaning thereby a personal deity. The mystic says, the atheist is right: the God of theistic imagination does not exist; the theist is also right,—that God is. Thus the person who cannot accept the theistic deity, and yet cannot believe the negation of atheism may find a secure, even if tentative, position in the mystic's 'that.'

The importance of such a position is that, as in the chess problem, one can keep going. The atheist necessarily stops thinking about a supernature or adjusting his life thereto. The mystic has something beyond nature to keep thinking about, to gain approximate or symbolic concep-

* In all these cases, the distinction is relative. There can be no 'that' without some 'what'; i. e., there must be enough 'what' to identify your object. Thus, if you know a law to be a law, or a motion to be a motion, it already has some 'what.' So, if I know 'that' God is, without knowing 'what' he is, I already know some 'what' about the One, enough to identify it as God. But though relative, the distinction does not lose its meaning.

tions of, and to live by. The 'that' of God's existence thus operates as what Kant called a 'regulative' idea; one whose meaning was not in any picture we could form, but in what it led us to do.

240. Third, the mystic believes, as the agnostic does not, that the quality of the Real, though not describable, can be *experienced* in a sort of direct knowledge which is far more satisfactory than the remoter knowledge of concepts, just as acquaintance with a person is a more satisfactory knowledge than the best description.

This immediate experience of the Real is regarded by the mystics as a somewhat unusual or privileged state of being. It is a sort of initiation, after which one is no longer an *outsider* in the world. They would, on the whole, agree with Bergson's language when he describes, we remember, the difficulty in reaching an intuition of the *élan vital*. So the vision of, or unity with, the Real, is difficult and exceptional: but, if the mystic is right, it is an experience which satisfies both the intellect and the will. It is often referred to as the 'beatific vision'; and the words of the great mystics—Plato or Plotinus, Eckhart or Dante—imply that it shows the Real as transcending in value what our commonplace descriptives can convey. It solves—or rather dissolves—for them the problem of evil; and establishes in the mind not merely a reconciliation to the difficulties of ordinary ex-

perience, but, as it were, a certain appetite for them.

Plato gives in the Symposium an allegorical picture of this experience:

"For he who has been instructed thus far in the things of love, and who has learned to see the beautiful in due order and succession, when he comes toward the end will suddenly perceive a nature of wondrous beauty—not growing and decaying, or waxing and waning; not fair in one point of view and foul in another . . . but beauty only, absolute, separate, simple, and everlasting, which without diminution and without increase or any change is imparted to the ever-growing and perishing beauties of all other things."*

Plotinus puts the matter thus:

"Now often I am roused from the body to my true self, and emerge from all else and enter myself, and behold a marvellous beauty, and am particularly persuaded at the time that I belong to a better sphere and live a supremely good life and become identical with the Godhead, and fast fixed therein attain its divine activity, having reached a plane above the whole intelligible realm; . . .

"Nor did he (who has had such a vision) concern himself with the beautiful, but had passed beyond beauty and had transcended the series of virtues as one might penetrate into the interior of the holy of holies, leaving behind in the temple the statues of the gods. These he would not see again until he came out after having had the vision of what lay within, and communion there with what was no statue or image but the divine itself—of which the statues

* Symposium, 210 f.

were but secondary images. And perhaps his experience was not a vision but some other kind of seeing, ecstasy and simplification and self-surrender, . . . a thought centred upon being merged in the divine."*

In this report of the mystic, however much or little we can make of it at the cold distance of our own description, we find corroboration of a surmise which must have come to every one at some time or other,—that the inherent value of the world is unlimited; that the reason for the apparent piebald mixture in our experience of moderately good and bad ingredients into a mongrel potpourri of so dubious a resultant value, that we can dally between optimism and pessimism, is a result of our dulness of sight rather than of the nature of things. The mystic is a radical, without caution, trimming, or compromise, in his assertion of the essential worth of life. And some mystics, at least, have lived as though that perception of worth, received in the rare moments of exceptional insight, had become a constant factor of their ordinary consciousness, altering judgment and action.

"Now since in the vision there were not two, but the seer was made one with the seen . . ., he who had been united with it might, if he remembered, have or keep by him some faint image of the divine."†

Thus it would be far from the truth to say

* Fuller's translation in Bakewell, Source Book in Ancient Philosophy, pp. 386, 392.

† Plotinus, Fuller's translation, op. cit., p. 391.

that the mystic's One because ineffable is therefore characterless and neutral.

But the attainment of this privileged insight into the nature of things cannot come from purely thoughtful exertion. It is the result of an effort primarily moral. We turn, therefore, to consider the practical aspect of mysticism.

Chapter XXXII

PRACTICAL MYSTICISM

241. From the words of Plato and Plotinus above quoted, it is evident that the mystic's experience of the Real is closely allied to our perception of beauty in Nature. Perhaps the simplest and most wide-spread form of mystic experience is that which finds in these occasional glimpses of beauty something more than an interesting play of form and the superficial qualities of things, namely, an indication that there is within Nature a reality akin to ourselves and as it were an invitation to realize our union with that inner reality. These words of Balfour would be significant to many who have no other conscious share in the vision of which the mystics speak:

"But when we look back on those too rare moments when feelings stirred in us by some beautiful object not only seem wholly to absorb us, but to raise us to the vision of things far above the ken of bodily sense or discursive reason, we cannot acquiesce in any attempt at explanation which confines itself to the bare enumeration of psychological and physiological causes and effects. . . . However little, therefore, we may be prepared to accept any particular scheme of metaphysical æsthetics—and most of these appear to me to be very absurd,—we must believe that somewhere and for some Being there shines an unchanging splendour of beauty, of which in Nature

and Art we see, each of us from his own standpoint, only passing gleams and stray reflections. No such mystical creed can, however, be squeezed out of observation and experiment; nor can it be forced into any sort of consistency with the naturalistic theory of the universe.*

In such a mystic as Rabindranath Tagore, beauty becomes the chief guide to metaphysical initiation, and art the chief means of conveying metaphysical truth.† But as Plato's words indicate, for the attainment of their privileged knowledge of the Real, even through the sense of beauty, the mystics with singular agreement have held that some kind of moral preparation, or discipline of the will, is needed.

242. In the more popular forms of mysticism, this discipline consisted in certain abstinences and ceremonies of purification. The Orphic rule forbade the eating of flesh, of certain kinds of fish, of beans, prescribed a peculiar garb, and in various ways required an ascetic habit of life. The more rational forms of mysticism required a searching self-examination, a review of one's habitual ways of thinking and wishing, and a mental enactment of rejection of whatever could be found partial or untrue in them. This often took the form of repudiating the objects of ordinary natural interest and ambition, not as essentially evil,

* The Foundations of Belief, pp. 65 f.
† Sadhana, esp. ch. 2. See Charles Bennett, Mysticism, ch. XV.

but as something less than the supreme good, and therefore as more or less obstructive to the free flight of the mind. According to Plotinus,

> "he, I say, will not behold this light, who attempts to ascend to the vision of the supreme while he is drawn downwards by those things which are an impediment to the vision. . . . He, therefore, who has not yet arrived thither . . . may consider *himself* as the cause of his disappointment through these impediments, and should endeavor *by separating himself from all things* to be alone."

In general, the mystic prescribes a sort of "flight from the world" in a vein of renunciation little sympathetic to our prevalent present temper. His way of moral preparation has been called, accordingly, the "Negative Path."

243. To give a foreshortened picture of this Negative Path, we may describe it as a 'world-flight' or retreat, physical, intellectual and moral.

The physical world-flight: In all concentration of thought there must be some leaning away from the distractions of the senses. Socrates in the Phædo makes a whimsical comment on this fact in the phrase "the true disciple of philosophy is likely to be misunderstood by other men; they do not perceive that he is ever pursuing death and dying,"—a remark which he explains in the dialogue as follows:

* Ennead VI, 9, iv. Taylor's translation.

What shall we say of the actual acquirement of knowledge? Is the body, if invited to share in the inquiry, a hinderer or a helper? Are not sight and hearing, as the poets are always telling us, inaccurate witnesses?—When does the soul attain truth? Must not existence be revealed to her in *thought*, if at all?

Yes.

And thought is best when the mind is gathered into herself, and none of these things trouble her—neither sounds nor sight nor pain nor any pleasure—when she has as little as possible to do with the body, and has no bodily sense or feeling, but is aspiring after being?

That is true.*

Likewise in that particular form of concentration known as worship or prayer, there seems to be an instinctive turning-away from the ordinary currents of sense-experience,—the modification of light and sound in the interior of the mosque, the incense, the checkage of physical activity, the postures which still further close the organs of sense. The mystics have developed this sort of procedure into a technique for concentration, or "recollection and quiet."

The intellectual world-flight: a process of systematically reminding oneself that all the concepts which we are accustomed to apply to reality are incompletely true, and must be rejected. It,

*Phædo, 65.

the Real, is not Nature; it is not matter; it is not energy; it is not power; it is not space, nor anything in space; it is not society nor the state. This process is called by some of the mystics, "laying aside the creatures"—i. e., the secondary realities. Meister Eckhart puts it:

> If a man will work an inward work, he must pour all his powers into himself as into a corner of the soul, and must hide himself from all images and forms. Then he must come into a forgetting and a not-knowing. He must be in a stillness and silence where the ineffable word may be heard. When one knows nothing, it is opened and revealed."*

Especially, we are advised, is it important to remind ourselves that the *distinctions and divisions* which our concepts make in the world of objects are misleading, since in reality all things are one. We must deny the boundaries which separate thing from thing, person from person, level from level, race from race, nation from nation. Wherein it appears that the mystic, by way of his negations, is reaching for a sense of the uniting element in things, a realization of the fraternal and equalitarian groundwork of the cosmos.

The moral world-flight: In like manner one enacts a denial that all partial goods are *the* good: none of them, passed in review, contents that Faustian element of our spirit which demands an object in which it can remain forever satisfied. So

* Predigten, ii. Underhill, 381.

the mystic requires himself to consider his various objects of desire and ambition, and to reject each one in turn: "this is not the good." Especially his invidious desires,—his rivalries, competitions, antipathies, must be put down. Even his virtues he must suspect as not being altogether good, and renounce all satisfaction in them. For the very fact that a virtue can be consciously known and named shows that it is somewhat corrupted by self-satisfaction, or warped away from that elemental simplicity of will which alone is absolutely right. Old Lao Tze says:

> If beauty makes a display of beauty, it is sheer ugliness; if goodness makes a display of goodness (even to oneself) it is sheer badness;
>
> Superior goodness resembleth water (transparent, pervading everything without self-assertion): the water's goodness benefiteth the ten thousand things, yet it quarreleth not (raising not its voice);
>
> Superior virtue is unvirtue: therefore it has virtue. Inferior virtue never loses sight of virtue; therefore it has no virtue. Superior virtue is non-assertion and without pretension. Inferior virtue asserts and makes pretensions.
>
> Abandon learnedness, and you have no vexation. Abandon your saintliness; put away your prudence (and the people will gain a hundredfold). Abandon your benevolence; put away your justice (and the people will return to filial piety and paternal devotion);

He who seeks learnedness will daily increase. He who seeks Tao (the Real) will daily diminish; he will continue to diminish until he arrives at non-assertion. With non-assertion there is nothing he cannot achieve.*

This moral world-flight is sometimes spoken of as a cultivation of *poverty* in a broad sense, poverty of possessions, of mind and of heart; in some cases including an actual renunciation of goods (Buddhist orders, Persian mystics, St. Francis), in others, a practice of dis-attachment from all emotional bonds and pride.

"I am not here speaking of the absence of *things*, —for absence is not detachment if the desire remains,—but of that detachment which consists in suppressing desire and avoiding pleasure. It is this that sets the soul free, even though possession may still be retained. . . . In detachment the spirit finds quiet and repose, for coveting nothing, nothing wearies it by elation, and nothing oppresses it by dejection. . . . That thou mayest have pleasure in everything, seek pleasure in nothing. That thou mayest know everything, seek to know nothing. That thou mayest possess all things, seek to possess nothing." †

244. It is evident that the Negative Path of the mystic is negative chiefly in form. He uses a negative method to reach a positive goal. He seeks to get rid of the misleading fascination of sub-

* Tao Teh King, adapted from Carus's translation, sections 2, 8, 38, 20, 19, 48.

† St. John of the Cross, Subida del Monte Carmelo, Bk. I, quoted by Underhill, Mysticism, 255, 249.

ordinate goods in order that the absolute good may appear unimpeded to his mind: in putting away what is partial, he hopes to become directly conscious of what is complete.

> "All those other things in which the soul once took pleasure—power, strength, wealth, beauty, science,—it now says that it holds in contempt. It would not say this if it had not come upon something better than these."*

For as Spinoza said—and Spinoza was very close to mysticism, both in his personally heroic life of renunciation, and in his idea of happiness as *amor intellectualis Dei*†—it is impossible to expel any passion from the mind except by a greater one.

According to some mystics, if your renunciation is sincere, the absolute good appears to you, as it were automatically:—"when the half gods go, the gods arrive." According to others, the culminating experience of 'illumination' is a gift which has to be waited for, with complete passivity and without demand. There is a transition in the will which cannot be effected by will,—for will operates upon something outside itself,—by which one passes into identity with the One which is also the Good. It is as if one who has been saying "You" to another person, now begins to say "We": in this transition from the second person

* Plotinus, Ennead VI, 7, xxxiv; quoted by Charles Bennett, Mysticism, p. 29.

† Spinoza's philosophy has been described as a mystic completion of a rationalistic base. R. McKeon, Philosophy of Spinoza, 27.

to the first, there is a new element of identification, without change in the objective facts of the world. The ineffable reality has to be adequately discerned by an ineffable will-attitude.

Here lies an essential difference between idealistic philosophy and mysticism. The idealist believes that the world is a Self. The mystic holds that this knowledge is accurate without being adequate, or quite deserving the name of knowledge. Idealism can never serve as a substitute for religion: and only in religion is metaphysical truth truly known. In the classic philosophy of India, Brahmanism, the universe is Brahm, and each person is Brahm. But the judgment "I am Brahm" must be something more than believed,—it must be 'realized.' To realize it is *ipso facto* to attain Nirvana. But one cannot by a violent stroke of will *resolve to realize*, any more than he can by great resolve realize the beauty of a symphony. The *right* to say "We" cannot be taken by force; it must be given, or, as it were, *happen* to one. Hence the necessity for this careful, perhaps life-long, discipline of the Negative Path,—the Yoga of the Hindus, the asceticism of the religiously ambitious in all great religious systems, the 'worship' of the multitudes. For common worship is a much abbreviated epitome of the Negative Path.

245. But what kind of practical living can

come out of such a direction of energy into the quest of a perhaps unattainable realization of absolute Being and absolute Good? Is this not a deliberate cult of alienation from this world and its proper business which might have harmonized with mediæval romanticism, but which we have now finally dismissed? Contemplation of the Real or the Good in their abstract perfection seems an idle occupation: was not Plato, as Professor Dewey suggests, after all a misleader of the race in teaching that there is some peculiar value in the pure vision or contemplation of an ideal essence? Ideals are to be embodied, not to be gazed at.

Further, there seems to be something fallacious in the mystic's conception of what he has achieved. If he comes into actual consciousness of the absolute Good, there is nothing more for him to wish for; no reason for return to any other kind of consciousness, or for doing anything else in the world. Perhaps he returns not because he wishes to, but because he cannot help it, being unable to sustain the vision. In that case he must still return with regret, and with averted sympathies, as one whose true interests are elsewhere.

As a matter of experience, this alienation does not as a rule take place. The Hindu mystic, it is true, is traditionally counselled to continue his worldly affairs, but *without desire!* This is the theme of the Bhagavadgita, the most influential

of Hindu poems, in which a prince on the eve of battle is represented as enquiring of the Deity whether, on strict philosophical grounds, he should fight or not fight. He is counselled to continue the combat, but as one

"looking alike on victory and defeat; who is alike toward the sides of friends and foes"*—

a state of mind which would seem to promise something less than an enthusiastic battle! But the typical mystic is one to whom action in the world has become more rather than less engaging. What he has gained from his discipline is not disaffection, but inner certainty, originality with stability of character, courage, a moral invulnerability which appears to be superior to ordinary fears but not at all superior to the positive objects in behalf of which he is courageous. Joan of Arc may serve, in this respect, as the typical mystic.

Is there not, then, something wrong in the the-

* "Having regard to your own duty you ought not to falter, for there is nothing better for a Kshatriya (one of the warrior caste) than a righteous battle. . . . Looking alike on pleasure and pain, on gain and loss, on victory and defeat, then prepare for battle, and thus you will not incur sin. . . . He is wise among men, he is possessed of devotion, who sees inaction in action. Forsaking all attachment to the fruit of action, always contented, dependent on none, he does nothing at all though he engages in action. Devoid of all expectation, restraining the mind and the self, and casting off all belongings, he incurs no sin. . . . To whom pleasure and pain are alike; to whom a sod and a stone and gold are alike; to whom what is agreeable and what is disagreeable are alike; to whom censure and praise of himself are alike; who is alike in honor and dishonor; who is alike towards the sides of friends and foes. . . ."—Sacred Books of the East, VIII, pp. 47, 48, 60, 110.

ory which supposes that the whole and absolute Good can be realized in a temporary experience, from which all consciousness of other things is excluded?

Let us answer first by enquiring whether mysticism can give us an *ethics*—that is to say, a code for action in the world—or whether it must limit its practical counsels to its Negative Path of retreat from the world.

246. When we consider that most, perhaps all, of the original moral codes of the world have been propounded by mystics, there can be no doubt about the fertility of mysticism in this direction. Perhaps a clew to this paradox may be found in the fact that successful action requires *a union of attachment and detachment.* There are two kinds of temper not likely to succeed and not deserving to succeed in any important undertaking: the temper which cares nothing about it, and the temper which cares everything. A man who was completely indifferent to public office would not deserve to win such office; nor would he deserve it if it would break his will to lose it. A man is right in his efforts, and we respect him, if he does his best to succeed and yet retains an inner immunity to success or failure because he is greater than any of his particular aims. What the mystic is doing in his discipline of negation is to secure that this inner immunity is a genuine fact of

character and not an assumed pose. He is attending, not to the whole of happiness, but to one indispensable condition of happiness.

247. The principle of all mystical codes of ethics may be stated in this simple form,

Be what you are,

that is, be in action what you are in reality. In reality, you are Brahm; you are identical with the most real; act, then, with the confidence, the freedom, the simplicity, the emancipation from petty sense allurements and social bribes, which belong to one who knows absolute values. To Lao Tze, Tao is the "law of heaven and earth"; and the code of life is simply Act according to Tao; express Tao in your conduct. As Tao is non-assertive, so be you non-assertive; as Tao is not revengeful, be you non-revengeful, requite evil with good.* Remember that all of the conventional virtues are *not enough;* "patriotism is not enough," neither is benevolence enough nor justice. Tao sets a simpler but a higher standard:

If one loses Tao, virtue appears;
if one loses virtue, benevolence appears;
if one loses benevolence, justice appears;
if one loses justice, propriety appears.
Propriety is the semblance of good faith, and the beginning of disorder.†

* Tao Teh King, 63, 49.

† Tao Teh King, 38.

This masterful attitude toward types of conduct which have the name of virtue fits the mystic to be a moral originator, a reformer of laws and customs. He has so often filled this rôle that it would be interesting to enquire whether any great reform had occurred in history without some mystic at the bottom of it. On the other hand, this same superiority to the letter of the law, in the confidence that one has an intuition of its meaning, makes an easy path for a soft-fibred and semi-sincere mystic to antinomianism (q. v.) and self-indulgence in the name of higher liberty,—a tendency which the mystic shares with the 'æsthetic temperament.' "Many are the thyrsus-bearers, few are the mystics," ran the Greek saying: many, we may say, are the near-mystics, and the spoiled mystics, few the true prophets. But these few are the indispensable men of history.

248. How does the ethical innovator know where customary morality, benevolence, justice, need revision? How does he know, for example, that the old saying, "An eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth," is a mechanical and inadequate way of meeting injury? He knows by way of his 'conscience.' What is conscience?

When we were speaking of the evolutionary theory, which would make conscience an hereditary relic of ancient punishments, we thought that theory disproved by the fact that conscience grows

more sensitive, like a gradually refining æsthetic sense, and rises in some individuals to the point of genius (§67). Thus in the career of Socrates, we have a literary record of the work of conscience—personified as his 'daemon'—in guiding his decisions at critical junctures. In him, conscience appeared as an unanalyzed sense of wrongness warning him away from certain courses of action which he was inclined to adopt. These actions were *incongruous with some inner standard* of whose nature he was hardly aware. That inner standard, we may suppose, is simply the persistent mystical sense of unity with the Real; and conscience is the intuitive recognition that a proposed course of action is, or is not, consistent with that unity.

If this is a true theory of conscience, we understand how it is that the mystics have been the great adepts of conscience, and the ethical pioneers of the race. We understand also why it is that the qualities of *moral courage* and *honor* are peculiarly associated with mysticism; for both imply a certain superiority to the risks of life and possessions which would naturally come from a belief (in which Kant shared) that conscience allies us with a reality deeper than the flow of natural events. We understand also why it is that conscience is variable; for conscience would be clear only as the sense of unity with the Real is strong, and this sense might require renewal from time to time by deliberate acts of attention. The Nega-

tive Path, then, would be understood as the process of renewing the sensitivity of conscience.

249. To return, then, to our question (§230), there is indeed something wrong in the theory of mysticism when it proposes the end of the Negative Path as an entire and self-sufficient good, the absolute Good. It is unjust to its own function in the world. The mystic vision, taken by itself, tends to vanish into the meaningless. Pure unity, unless it were understood to be the unity of something plural, would be a nondescript unity indistinguishable from nothing. The experience of the mystic, and the discipline that leads up to it, belong somehow in the circuits of a life within the world of nature and human history.

Chapter XXXIII

MYSTICISM EXAMINED

250. The mystic, we say, in his direct vision of the Real reaches something which as he defines it ought to be the end and culmination of life,*—all continuance an anticlimax. Yet this experience has some function to perform for the rest of life, and works in with it. The explanation lies, I believe, in what I shall call the *law of alternation.*

The law of alternation is a practical principle, perhaps the chief of practical principles. It declares that we cannot make out a good life either by exclusive contemplation of the One or by intelligent management of the Many: but that we must have both, in the form of a rhythm, like the rhythm of work and play or of sleep and walking.

Life requires of us, in the first place, concentrated, realistic attention to business. This specialized attention analyses its world of objects and affairs; and focuses its best intelligence on each thing in order. Now experience shows that this kind of attention, when prolonged, brings about a

* In Dante's words:

> It may not be
> That one who looks upon that light can turn
> To other object willingly his view,
> For all the good that will may covet there
> Is summ'd; and all, elsewhere defective found,
> Complete.—Paradiso, Canto xxxiii.

decline of power,—not alone to act, but even to see facts and to feel values. On realistic principles, this ought not to be: for facts are facts and values are values, and the knower has nothing to do but open his eyes to them. But for the weary head, these 'independent' objects have a way of becoming imperceptible. The value and meaning of a thing prove to be not in itself alone, but in something the perceiver brings to it, some freshness of vision which fatigue has lost. There is a background *with which* I meet experience: disorganize that background,—as, for example, by committing a crime,—and nothing remains the same, none of the familiar objects are quite themselves. The continued strain of attention in the day's work *runs down* our capacity to see what is there. Chesterton avows he must leave Battersea in order to be able to perceive Battersea. Life requires, then, a periodic re-charging, in order to win even its most material successes.

This recharging is accomplished in many ways, as by rest, play, sleep; all of them involve the reversal of the direction of attention and the contemplation of what unites rather than what separates. The mystic's moral discipline, his Negative Path, provides the most direct and pertinent technique of re-creation. It involves the breaking of mental habit, release of strained attention in detail, recovery of sense of the whole. Every prepossession being passed in review and rejected, one's

individual crotchets, prejudices, antipathies and petrifications are limbered up in such wise that something new may emerge, something nearer what one's perception of the whole would suggest. Thus the mystic experience has for its function the recovery of freedom as well as of the sense of value. And since the contemplation of the unity of things itself *runs down* when it becomes perfect and prolonged, the mystic must turn again to the world and discover it as having regained its lost fascinations, and himself his lost powers.

251. We may put the matter this way: the mystic has recovered the power to be realistic, to *face the facts.* Note several ways in which this takes place:

First of all, the power of plain *scientific observation.* What we call the scientific attitude toward the world is clearly the result of a moral development,—a new reverence for Nature (as in Bruno) developing into a new care in recording fact and discerning natural law. It has come to appear to us not merely a scientific but a moral duty to submit our minds to the evidence found in experience: the honesty required for scientific work, the suppression of what one wishes to find in favor of what one does find, have become moral axioms for all students of nature. The mystic, then, is entirely right in his doctrine that the *chief conditions for truth getting are moral,*—not alone the

metaphysical truth of the One, but the truth of physical detail as well.

The discovery of new hypotheses calls for something more than faithful observation: it requires imagination. But not every imagination will do. What distinguishes the successful from the unsuccessful explorer of nature is in the first place *simplicity and open-mindedness*,—freedom from pretence and personal vanity, showing itself in cravings to be different or ingenious or in the haste to gain startling results,—and in the second place a kind of sixth sense about the way Nature works which can only come from a *love of the thing*. Both of these are moral qualities, and such qualities as the mystic's discipline is particularly fitted to develop. Said Ruskin:

> that virtue of originality that men so strain after is not newness—it is only genuineness,—not very different from what I call transparency. . . . What we call genius is largely extreme genuineness. . . . There are people so fundamentally simple that they are no longer embarrassed by all the irrelevant details which obscure the outlook of the average man; they see the essential at the first glance and go straight to it.

It is thus no accident that we so often find the mystic in the person or in the immediate tradition of the man of scientific genius.

252. Further, the mystic recovers the power to appreciate facts of the *qualities of things*, achiev-

ing a new innocence of the senses so that flowers, sounds, colors are felt as if for the first time: such, at any rate, seems to be the experience of William Blake, Jacob Boehme, Francis of Assisi and others. And therewith we remember that there is room here also for much new exploration, or perhaps for the exhuming of whole realms of sense-appreciation which man in his realistic march has surrendered from ancient animal inheritance.

And he acquires or recovers the power to face the facts of *social intercourse*, and thus to extend his capacity for friendship. Friendship, among other objects of appreciation, has its own way of running down; largely because, as it develops, there come occasions for saying truths we judge to be unwelcome, and we cannot command the art to say them without offense. We are not able wholly to eliminate the self-interest from our criticism. One needs something like the mystic detachment from self in order to find that common ground with his neighbor which will enable him to denounce him, say to him "Thou art the man," in such wise as to leave the friendship strengthened rather than destroyed.

253. If we are right, then, it requires the mystic to be a completely successful realist; and the realist to be a successful mystic. The practical conduct of life falls into a normal alternation between work and worship, each phase sharpening the need for the other.

Only by some such alternation can mankind keep at par, and remain fit for the increasing burdens of an intricate civilization with its growing (and rightly growing) load of material power. For with this material load, the race must grow *pari passu* in its capacity for transparent observation, for artistic sensitivity, and for friendly personal and national relationships.

254. And with this practical principle of alternation there goes a corresponding metaphysical truth. The Real cannot be either the absolute One of the mystic or the absolute Many revealed by realistic analysis. The Mystic and the Realist, each being guided in what he sees by his practical pre-occupation, and believing final what he most effectively deals with, each grasps *half of the truth* about the world. Each therefore supplements and corrects the other.

As against the realist, the mystic is right in declaring the unity of the world, and the infinite worth of that unity. A world of plural substances is an incalculable, and therefore essentially hopeless world. And a world devoid of any inherent quality commanding reverence or permitting rational worship, must be devoid also of that spring of mental re-creation and fertility, without which nothing is useful.

As against the mystic, the realist is right in asserting the reality of the many. If there is a

God, his life must run into the multiple facts of a differentiated world-order: if he is anywhere, he must be also in those facts. A unity which runs away from diversity, and has no explanation of how that diversity has come to be, cannot be the final truth about the universe. The One we can believe in must be a One which needs and is able to produce the Many.

Both realism and mysticism thus appear as aspects of an idealistic world-view, which explains and places them both; while they, in turn, make clearer the practical necessity of rhythm or alternation. An element of supernaturalism (asceticism and world-flight) must be taken together with an element of humanism to make up a working programme of the good life.

PART IV

SYNTHESIS OF THE TYPES

Chapter XXXIV

THE STRUCTURE OF A PHILOSOPHY

255. Our business hitherto has been to understand the fundamental types of philosophy rather than to pass judgment upon them. I have made critical comments on various of these types in passing, not as offering a final assessment, but as indicating the motives which lead me in each case to go farther in my own search for truth. It is now our business to consider, each for himself, where he stands; certainly not in the vain hope of finishing one's world-view, but by way of demanding of ourselves what result is left by the working of these types upon our minds, whether any coherent view or direction.

Your philosophy will be made of the sum of the truths you see. The review of these types must have aided this seeing, by bringing into clearer expression many an idea which you had vaguely apprehended before. It may be that you have recognized some one of these types as your own. On the other hand, it is not likely that any great strand of human thought, such as these types are, is wholly alien to you. It is conceivable that you may find yourself belonging to all types, and to none. Mental hospitality is in danger of finding

itself encumbered with an ill-fitting assortment of beliefs, composed of fragments from various types: there is 'something in' all of them! This state of mind is intelligent and liberal; but also deficient in strength and decisiveness,—a success, which is a relative failure. No one wants to live with a patchwork philosophy. Without limiting your breadth of view, I should like to put you on the way of escape from this situation.

256. You have probably noticed that not many of the greater thinkers are perfectly typical. Spencer is not a pure naturalist; for he believes that there is a reality, though unknowable, beyond or behind nature. Plato is a dualist; yet, since he describes matter as a certain sort of 'non-existence,' he leans toward idealism,—an idealism of so interesting a variety that one strand of neo-realism could emerge from it! Aristotle, with another vein of realism in his temper and way of thinking, inclines strongly to idealism in his metaphysics. Divergent lines of thought go out from Socrates, all claiming their rootage in that great character; and the same may be said for Descartes, Kant, Hegel. A man need be no pluralist to have plural strands in his philosophy. The stimulating and fertilizing force of a thinker is often a symptom of a moral and intuitive vigor which may outrun his logical consecutiveness. Such men take truth where they see it, and as

they see it, whether or not their grasp of it achieves perfect coherence; believing that truth is consistent with itself, and that the discovery of its manner of hanging-together may wait. Meantime they defy our classifications; and we think of them as too great to be contained in an '-ism,'—as if in the very conception of a type of philosophy there were something belittling to men of the first order of genius.

This same unclassifiable quality is a prevalent trait of contemporary systems, not necessarily because of their greatness, but because of their sophistication, their knowledge of the history of thought, and to some extent of a deliberate striving for originality. But further, this is a natural result of the way of reaching philosophy in which this age believes, and which is peculiar to no school: the way, namely, of putting experience first, and letting the categories which unify the mass follow along. Experience (including intuition) we have recognized as the scouting faculty of thought; and no one doubts that whoever limits his acquisition to what he can then and there put into order must condemn himself to poverty. The existence, then, of a degree of incoherence or disorder in one's philosophical outlook does not at once condemn it. It may be fairly said of William James that he had no system; in him idealism, realism, pragmatism and mysticism coexisted without achieving a final consistency.

257. The assemblage of beliefs from various sources into a composite philosophy has been frequently enough resorted to in the history of philosophy to receive a special name,—*eclecticism.* The electics whose names have been preserved have been thinkers, for the most part, of greater ingenuity than power, and relatively devoid of originality: the inner variety of their philosophy has been due not to an excess of explorative spirit, but to a sensitive docility in appropriating the thoughts of others. They see that different fragments of truth belong to *them;* they assume that they can be made to fit each other; they lack the ability to see how they fit. The name eclectic is thus not a term of the highest honor in philosophy. It has been applied to such thinkers as Philo of Alexandria, Simplicius, Cicero, Horace, Mendelssohn, Victor Cousin.

Victor Cousin* deserves a special place, because in him eclecticism became a consciously avowed principle. "Each system," he said, "expresses an order of phenomena and ideas which is in truth very real, but which is not alone in consciousness . . . whence it follows that each system is not false but incomplete, and that in reuniting all incomplete systems we should have a complete philosophy, adequate to the totality of consciousness." One could adopt such a principle only if he believed that all important truth about

* 1762–1867; French philosopher and educator.

the world had already been proposed, so that the work of the philosophic mind of the present can only be one of judicious selection and adjustment. The eclectic has his eye directly to the history of thought: the thinker whose disorder comes from abundant originality has his eye directed to experience,—his observations and intuitions.

Still, the difference between the eclectic and the untypical original thinker is but gradual; since no degree of originality can safely ignore the history of thought, or decline the liberty of taking from whatever source what it finds true. In this respect Aristotle is to some extent eclectic; and St. Thomas Aquinas, who creates a compound of Aristotle with Christian theology, still more so. The realistic attitude toward the world would naturally encourage the eclectic disposition; and radical empiricism, urging us to be completely open-minded and free from pre-conceptions about the world, even that of perfect inner consistency (and not objecting to our seeing things through other people's eyes so long as we see those same things through our own eyes) would abet this tendency, through making a sort of principle of lack of principle.

258. Eclecticism appears to be a preliminary stage of philosophical construction, the collector-stage. Its spirit is allied to that strange virtue we call *toleration*, which modifies all our dispositions

to strict partisanship with the caution,—Your opponent is worth listening to; there is some good reason for the way he thinks! Toleration is a difficult and incomprehensible virtue to those who can grasp their beliefs in clear-cut outlines, and thoroughly disbelieve what they disbelieve, because they believe what they believe! Unless it is the virtue of the educator or lawmaker, it is the virtue of the incompletely certain mind, or of the eclectic, alert for still further portions of his ever unfinished collection of truths.

There is thus a close affiliation between eclecticism and scepticism. The man who takes something from all sides must discount every side; for whatever opinion he considers with favor he will have something in common with its opponent also or its possible future critic. Like the sceptic, he will be too wise to lend himself whole-heartedly to anything. Thus universal hospitality is but the affirmative form of universal doubt.

259. Eclecticism cannot be a satisfactory resting place for thought; though it may well be a necessary stage to go through. It does not lie within one's will to reject a proposition he believes true merely on the ground that he does not at the time see its connection with his other beliefs. One's first business as a knower of the world is accumulation.

But it is always a self that accumulates: and a

self is a unity which cannot forever live, or face the prospect of living, with mental disorder. One must believe that the world of reality is consistent with itself; inconsistency is a subjective condition, not an objective fact. If there is no overt consistency among our beliefs, there must be a *latent* consistency among such of them as are true; and we are bound to find it. For we cannot lead completely rational lives until that latent agreement among our scattered insights can be grasped as a principle giving unity to the whole world-view.

There is thus but one way to be adequately hospitable without being eclectic: that is by discovering the single principle which shows how the various parts of truth belong together. Your philosophy is not your collection: it is your principle.

260. *The dialectical method.* Attempts have been made in the history of philosophy to work out a systematic method of discovering such a final principle. Socrates and Plato developed a method of mental experimentation, which Plato called the 'dialectic'—a method well fitted for use in conversation or dialogue. It consisted in taking up any belief one of the speakers chose to present; treating it as an hypothesis, and following it ruthlessly to its extreme conclusions. An element of humor entered the treatment of these deductions in the hands of the deft Greek masters

of dialectic, through the fact that the sustainers of the hypothesis would occasionally find themselves on the opposite side of the argument from that which they entered. If for this reason, or any other, the consequences of the hypothesis were unacceptable, a new hypothesis must be tried; and the process may be continued until one is found which leads to no error. Thus the dialectic is a progressive thinking process; and in Plato's management of the dialogue, the various hypotheses considered would be those which were upheld in the current philosophies of his day: the various types of philosophy would appear, so to speak, in person, and contribute each one its quota to the final result. The true hypothesis would be the dialectical survivor,—not the survivor in a Darwinian struggle, for the competitors, instead of being killed off, are preserved after correction in their subordinate places.

It is evident that this method has much in common with the empirical and experimental method of to-day: it is, in fact, a form of induction.

In modern philosophy this method reappears with a peculiar sharpening of its angles. It was Hegel who most exploited it: in his view, every imperfect opinion, when carried out to its consequences, betrays itself into the opposing camp. Antithetical opinions generate one another, very much as tyranny brings forth anarchy, and anarchy tyranny; they may live side by side for

a long time without knowing their kinship, regarding one another as pure antagonists. But when the situation is seen, the thesis and antithesis require a *synthesis*,—a new opinion which shall preserve the truth of each of the hostile opinions, and eliminate their inconsistency. This synthesis Hegel sometimes represents as logically derived from the antithesis; but for the most part it is evidently a new idea, brought into the situation like any other new idea, by a stroke of inductive invention. Any synthesis is truer than its component theses; but it may itself be an incomplete truth, and thus beget its own antithesis, so that a further synthesis is required. The final synthesis is found when we have a proposition which every attempt to deny reaffirms.

This method Hegel applies to the history of philosophy: he finds the various divergent philosophies begetting one another, and giving way to their synthesis when it arrives. In this way, he preserves the valid elements of opposing types in his final result (his own philosophy, of course; for to every man his own belief must be that true belief to which the history of thought, as he reads it, leads). At the same time, the structure of this world of truth has revealed itself to him as he proceeds: he achieves a world-view of vast empirical and historical richness without eclecticism. The final truth at which he arrives is that the world is Spirit: understanding that it is the na-

ture of the Spirit to express itself in these dialectical developments in the world of ideas, in nature, and in history. The universe is the living and progressive embodiment of an absolute thinking-process. And we, if we come upon the right dialectical connection of ideas, find there the essence of reality, and reproduce the scheme of the world in ourselves.

Leaving Hegel's result out of account, we may recognize in his idea of a 'synthesis,' as something quite different from an addition of heterogeneous truths, or a compromise, the sort of relation among partial insights which we desire as the eventual principle of our philosophy to hold,—a rescue from eclecticism. And we may also recognize in the dialectical method a valuable aid in finding this principle. It does full justice to the empirical and experimental genius of our age, while recognizing, as empiricism does not, that the last truth in order of discovery may well be a *necessary* truth,—one which has been from the very first an unrecognized factor in our thought. *The final success of the inductive method is the uncovering of necessary or a priori* truth. And we know when we have such truth, because when we try to deny it, we reaffirm it, as we have seen the sceptic doing when he proposes as truth the statement that there is no truth.

261. No matter what your philosophy is, it will

necessarily correspond, in part, with one or more of these types; for they present, on fundamental questions, the possible alternatives. You cannot avoid bringing the 'isms into your collection; and there is no reason except vanity for wishing to avoid it. For again, no matter what your philosophy is, it will necessarily be an individual perception, the report of an intuition of the world which corresponds precisely with that of no other person. Since each human being is both universal and unique: universal as sharing a world of sense, of thought and of history with his kind, and unique as seeing these from a position and in a light peculiar to himself;—so is the principle of his philosophy universal and also unique. I would say it is unique first and universal afterward. That is, the life of each individual is at first a summary and unsharable intuition of reality: it becomes his business to find what that intuition means, and then to convey or express so much of it as he can. This is at once his duty and his happiness.

Chapter XXXV

CONFESSIO FIDEI

262. In saying so much, I have already made, in germ, a statement of my own philosophic creed, —a statement which, on various counts, I owe to you. Working out a philosophy, as we said at the beginning, is an inevitable activity for a rational being: if it is, in addition, a 'duty' and also a 'source of happiness,' that interesting conjunction indicates something about the nature of the universe in which this philosophizing takes place.

In a dead or meaningless universe there could be no such thing as a *duty* to reflect about the whole of things. On the contrary, it might be a human duty to forget about it and attend to the day's business. There could be no utility in contemplating what no human technique can control and no human purpose survive. There is only one absolute source of duty; that is, the way to one's destiny, which means, in practice, the way to one's next stage of growth. (Thus one says of a particularly good play or opera or book, "You ought not to miss that"). Only one thing could make philosophizing a duty; and that is that the universe has an intrinsic meaning which one ought not to miss, but perceive and enjoy. In fact, unless the universe has meaning, philosophizing be-

comes a meaningless occupation; for we might define philosophy as the effort to interpret experience as a whole, that is, to find the meaning of things. If things have no meaning, philosophy is ideally futile.

It follows that every philosophy of whatever type is bound to assume that the universe has a meaning (or a system of meanings); a meaning which is objective, in the sense that it is there whether or not you or I discover it, but which can be discerned by us.* And since meanings are something more than the bare facts of the natural order, all philosophy is, in its assumptions, contradictory to naturalism, taking naturalism strictly as the negative doctrine that Nature is all there is.

263. And since meanings are abstractions unless they are somehow known or felt or appreciated, the existence of objective meaning in the world implies some kind of mental life at the core of reality. To this extent, I believe that idealism is not so much a separate type of philosophy as the essence of all philosophy, an assumption whether recognized or unrecognized of the philosophic enterprise itself. I take idealism, then, so far as this argument carries us, as the centre of my metaphysics. And I take this as a point of

* For a further development of this idea see the article "What Does Philosophy Say?", Philosophical Review, March, 1928 (xxxvii, No. 2).

certainty, established by the dialectical method of which we were speaking. One who should say "The world has no objective meaning" would, as I see it, contradict himself.

264. This amount of idealism one may regard as a sort of philosophic minimum. The mystic, I believe, is much more adequate in his judgment that the world is an almost untouched reservoir of significance and value, whose quality we sense in passing perceptions of beauty in nature; or in love, which always comes as a surprise strangely reflecting on our previous inability to see, so that we say of ourselves,

> Atheists are as dull
> Who cannot guess God's presence out of sight;

or still more continuously in that vague but inescapable sense of impending possible good for which we continue to hope while we live. What is living? Striving? Yes: incessant striving, but not 'dumb striving.' Living is reaching out to the reality of things as a region in which the discovery of value need never end. In philosophy, this conviction counts as the mystic's; but in this respect, I believe, again, that every man is an avowed or unavowed mystic,—even the Schopenhauers.

265. But why not be content with the judgment that the world has a meaning (and that the

old teleological argument was essentially right after all)? Why believe in such a plenum of meaning? Surely this is an *a priori* prejudice. It is not 'optimism' in the sense that good has to happen to everybody in the long run: the good has to be found, and we all run a chance of missing it. More than that, every one does, as a matter of fact, miss much of it, perhaps most of it. That is the essential and pervasive element of tragedy in the world. But I believe that the meaning is there: and how does that agree with our intellectual duty to take things as we empirically find them, the meaningful and the meaningless mixed together in experience?

There is, to be sure, something matter-of-fact in all discoveries of good. We could never deduce music, for example, from any previous knowledge about sound; and certainly not from any general theorem to the effect that objective values exist. We have to be as empirical as you please about the flavors of olives, a boat race, the Syrian desert. Values 'emerge.' Does not this pure unanticipable discovery of quality carry with it an equal requirement to be empirical toward the meaningless? There is much in the world we can only accept: it is blank datum,—there it is! The realistic temper in us demands that we rub our noses against such facts, and acknowledge them.

Willingly; but for how long? Philosophies which run into a wall of blank datum and end

there are either tentative or lazy. They dare never say, These things have no meaning, but only, We have not found any, and regard it as not worth while to try. Such terminal empiricism toward the meaningless is but a personal confession: it implies nothing about the world, but only that the speaker should make way for the poet or the artist, who can see. Empiricism can set up no negatives: and we know this of the world, that values *keep emerging* as we enlarge our capacity and learn the adjustment of our instruments of vision.

266. I should go farther with idealism, and say that the world is a self. And I should immediately add, in explanation, that the self, so far from being a wholly evident and graspable being, as Descartes and Berkeley seemed to assume, is infinite in its depth and mystery. It is only with this understanding that it can be used as a concept for the whole of things: the infinite is measured by the infinite and the unknown by the unknown. Here again mysticism is nearer the truth than much current idealism.* This word self indicates

* When I speak of what the mystic knows of the self, I am distinctly not referring to an element of semi-occultism which runs through contemporary psychology under the head of the 'subconscious.'

The subconscious is a veritable fact, and a vastly important fact in mental life. That is no reason for making it the home of a host of mythical hobgoblins, complexes, and ghosts; or speaking of it as the 'unconscious' and imagining one understands an unconscious mental state, as something half-way between mind and body, when one uses the word 'force' or 'impulse' and thinks of swimming with ones' eyes shut!

Under the veiled and mechanized form which the 'subconscious'

chiefly that the mental life within the world has its unity, and that all the meanings of things cohere in a single will.

May not all the selfhood in the world be a manifestation of something more profound or higher? No. For there is nothing higher than selfhood, and nothing more profound. Spinoza's Substance, with an infinitude of other attributes, unless it were conscious and self-conscious, would be lower in being than the simplest of mankind. Within the Selfhood of substance there is room for all the unfathomed majesty of reality.

267. The human self, which we take as an imperfect image of the whole cosmos, is a thing of nature and also something more than that.

This human self must be made an object of scientific study, in its relations to its environment, as the naturalistic program requires. There are laws of learning, of habit, and the like which (since they are not used to 'manage' us), we have no reason to disown or to break across. Psychology, as a natural science, may explain a great deal about ourselves; provided we understand by 'ex-

has assumed in contemporary psychology, following the lead of Schopenhauer and von Hartmann, it has been the means of concealing from view all the fertile (though weirdly expressed) inquiry into the self as ethical agent, as judge and creator of art, as logician and philosopher, which the early idealists were chiefly concerned with. These activities represent far more nearly what the self is than do either laboratory reactions or mysterious subliminal cravings. The nearly complete loss of all this earlier work to psychology is the penalty which science pays when one form of obscurantism finds itself unable to speak or interpret the language of another.

plaining' not deriving one thing from another, but simply showing a law of variation. Thus vibration does not explain color in the sense that color is derived from vibration; but differences in vibration-rate may explain variation in color. The physical fact does not produce the mental fact; but changes in the one correspond with changes in the other.

The human self is more than a thing of nature, because it is more than a fact: facts are not conscious of facts,—the self is; facts are not values, —the self lives on values and is a value; facts are particulars, not universals,—the self is both; facts are present,—the self spans past and future. And because of these things, while facts are as they must be, the self is free: it determines, out of a matrix of plural possibilities, which one shall be the fact of the next moment.

The self is thus a union of opposites. And because precisely the same opposites are discernible in the composition of the larger cosmos and must somehow be united there, we may transfer the problem of this 'somehow' in part to the world within, as we do when we recognize that the whole is a self. The ultimate evidence for the selfhood of the whole is not primarily the evidence of argument, however, nor of analogy, but that of immediate experience, interpreted by the dialectic. We, as a group of human selves, know that we are not alone in the universe: that is our first and persistent intuition.

268. This proposition, that the world is a self, I regard as a point of certainty in philosophy. And therewith I confess another belief,—the belief that *philosophy aims at certainty*, and can be content with nothing less. If one wishes to be emphatic, one may say absolute certainty,—there is no logical difference between certainty and absolute certainty. Some such certainty is necessary to give structure to our system of knowledge, as well as to the experimental business of daily life. The life of knowledge as well as the life of action swings, I believe, in irregular rhythm or alternation, between this pole of certainty and the region of exploration, tentativeness, probability, hypothesis.

"Absolutism" I know, is a word of reproach for the present age of thought. Rigid codes of truth and law and morals are recognized as deadly: it has been the genius of our age to get away from their shackles. The scientific spirit is open to the perennial revision of ideas: we must be ready to accept a new hypothesis to-morrow. Yes: but *by how much* is your hypothesis new? By all that you have believed to-day? Then you are no longer the same self from day to day, and your mental world has become an insane place not worth living in.

There is a certain illusion in our estimate of the degree of change that is going on: it is the fascinating aspect of experience, also the aspect which requires our *qui vive* and so holds attention.

But the history of all social revolutions reminds us that there is a law of continuity in history: there is a similar law in the revolutions of thought. There is more than continuity: there is a *principle of changelessness* in the basis of things, on which certainty can take hold and remain certain. That is the objective counterpart of the changelessness of the self which apprehends and enjoys change.

It is true that we must be ready to revise our hypotheses: that is why we call them hypotheses. We must likewise be ready to revise the laws of our life. But what if in doing so we dismantle also the spirit of lawfulness and the 'rule of law'? Then the change of laws becomes nonsense. We rely—when we talk about changing laws—on the stability of the 'that' while we experiment with the 'what.' When a contemporary prophet, urging "the transitional character of our times" (all times are transitional), admonishes us that "as nothing is permanent either in institutions or in thought, we must stand ready to revise all the old rules of religion and sex, art and letters, politics and law," we hear what is in a sense a truism rather excitedly proclaimed; but what, if presented as the whole truth, is an exemplary untruism. It can never be a question for religion, sex, art, letters whether all things change. It can only be a question what things are changeable, what are relative to time and place, and what things are stable. It is the first business of philosophy to make evident what

is stable, in order that change may go on with freedom of conscience and success. Instrumentalism, in the interest of its polemic, neglects the one thing needful.

The true experimental spirit is that of the mystic, who regards every fixed habit as tentative, and every conceptual standard as provisional, not because there is nothing absolute, but *because there is:* and because—since there is this absolute standard—every conceptualized mental property must recurrently be brought to court to bear comparison with it. By renewing from time to time his perception of that absolute real and good he prepares himself for those fresh contacts with reality in social and natural experience, which are destined to revise no one knows how much of the crusty shell of our assumed axioms and prejudices.

The scientific method itself (which every contemporary philosophy hastens to claim as its own peculiar ally, realism, naturalism, pragmatism in particular) is no partisan of unlimited relativity and change. For the scientific method would be nothing without the logic and mathematics it persistently uses. Probability itself must be reckoned by a calculus which is beyond the reach of probability. The realists have done well in asserting for this aspect of truth a certain independent finality. The pragmatic declaration that the experimental method is the only method, and that therefore all truth must be held tentatively, is a

prime example—in so far as it regards this thesis itself as permanently true—of a self-refuting position.

Thus realism also agrees that there is certainty in philosophy: but certainty of an abstract sort; whereas the intuitionist adds to this abstraction the effect of experience, making it a concrete certainty. This concrete certainty however must be rationally—in this case, dialectically—established. It is this which makes the distinction between philosophy and art. Rationality is the genius of philosophy: and in this sense *all philosophy is rationalism.*

269. As on the side of epistemology, so on the side of practical philosophy, I believe in a mystical realism, which is the only tenable sort of realism.

We must treat things in the day's work as if they were independent, naturalistic, over against us and *against* us, or at least, not for us. Struggle to build a human habitation in the midst of an alien universe; unremitting effort to expel by the aid of science whatever is evil from our point of view; expecting no good from the universe except what we human beings construct in the face of nature and except the universe itself; and admitting no wrong as inherent in the constitution of things:—this is the programme in which we join the realist.

But who has the eye for this humanistic work, and the endless patience and energy for it, in view of the fact that the task defined is nothing short of infinite? Who can wait until the end of evolution for an achievement which only remote posterity can ever see? Only one who in some way already is at the goal, as the mystic is (who for us represents the religious spirit). For him, reality in its fulness is always accessible where he is: he is always in the middle of time and space and history; he is never neurotically anxious to catch the *dernier cri*, nor hurried on to a remote goal. He alone can labor with endless resources and patience for what may yet be; for he knows that the nature of things is with him. He knows that there can be no incommensurable relation between the task and the power to deal with it. He knows that what is in him is the same substance that has set the object and established its over-againstness. He is assured, with Confucius, that the "good man is a ternion with Heaven and Earth."

270. It was one of the strengths of naturalism that it had an explanation for the propensity of the race to religion. The mystical-realism which we are here presenting has its corresponding explanation of the propensity of the race to naturalism, as the mode of thought fitted to the outswing of the alternation of life.

But this is naturalism on its positive side, not

on the side of its negations. It is, let us say, a *transfigured naturalism,* which enlarges physical nature by making it a province within a greater nature.

Of this enlarged conception of nature we may say what we say about the self: it is not in reality a scheme of mathematical phenomena shifting lawfully through endless space and time. It is infinite with an inner life of its own. The reality of Nature is the sum of all the meaning that can be found in it. Taking Nature as Schelling took it, or Bruno, or Royce; not reading its inner being from the atoms upward but from consciousness in all directions:—taking nature in this way, it and its laws become the expression of an ultimate purpose and significance. And nature in turn, with its vast impersonality, removes that taint of arbitrariness which is likely to cling to our usual conceptions of 'mind' and of God.

Thus, in Dante's Inferno, the literal element of the allegory presents the punishments of the damned as having been inflicted by the will of God. In the deeper sense of the poem there is nothing arbitrary or conventional in the fortunes of these spirits; but the poet is working out, in pictorial symbols, the inherent logic of various forms of vice, wrong, or simple absence of positive good. He is considering the lots of these souls as a working of a natural law; only, a type of law which like the Hindu law of Karma, applies to ethical

distinctions, and so works out perfect and invariable justice. Such a conception is akin to naturalism; but a naturalism so transformed that the inner mechanism of nature is not a lifeless, but a moral lawfulness; and the destiny of the self is not limited by the exigencies of any single time-space order.

Some such naturalism as this, so far from being inconsistent with an idealistic metaphysics, is an essential part of the world-picture. It is only the mystic-idealist who is justified in exploring all the 'hard facts' and facing all the risks of a naturalistic system of experience, neither defying them nor running away.

271. Humanism, some one said, is a sort of "class consciousness,"—we men banded together in solidarity against the universe outside. Yet to fix our mind upon the human interest is to lose the best things that have come to mankind. These have arrived by way of a love of art or of science, as we say, for its own sake; with humanity relatively out of the focus. How can you do good to individual men, each of whom contemplates eternity, unless you yourself contemplate eternity? Consider a man as a group of instincts hailing from animal ancestry, best understood by looking backward, and you can do him a limited amount of good, and that at the cost of his humiliation. Consider him as a group of impulses tending forward to a

will to be immortal, and you find material interests taken care of as incidents. Humanism can be fulfilled only in a world that sustains the zest of doing one's human job as a religious observance. This can continue only if the world is worth that kind of devotion. Humanism depends on a transfigured naturalism which is idealism.

272. This view does justice also to the pragmatic outlook. For the unfinished part of the world, in which the will to believe has its rightful play, is vaster than idealism usually represents. Human life as we find it *is* not free, sacred, immortal. It must be made free; its sacredness must be conferred upon it; its immortality must be won. In these respects we are the creators of our own destinies: even beyond the humanistic limit, the world of our destiny shall be what we believe and make it.

INDEXES

INDEX OF NAMES

Abelard, 249.
Alexander, S., 59, 277, 324, 357, 368.
Aliotta, 174.
Al Ghazzali, 126, 378, 387.
Anabaptists, 388.
Anaxagoras, 214, 219.
Anselm, 76, 249.
Aquinas, Thomas, 250, 324, 325, 331, 429.
Aristotle, 5, 16, 107, 232, 237, 298, 324, 325, *328 f.*, 331, 341, 426, 429.
Augustine, 214, 249.
Aurelius, Marcus, 14.

Bacon, Francis, 80 f., 280.
Bagehot, Walter, 393.
Bakewell, Charles, 24, 70.
Balfour, Arthur, 140, 146, 214, 399.
Bennett, C. A., 174, 198, 378, 400, 406.
Bentham, Jeremy, 298.
Bergson, Henri, ch. XIII; 174, 180, 187, 214, 221, 229, 232, 238, 247, 270, 277, 294, 395.
Berkeley, George, ch. XXI; 134, 245, 250, 254, 266; 324, 331, 338, 341, 362, 440.
Bernard of Clairvaux, 388.
Blake, William, 383, 388, 419.
Boehme, Jacob, 383, 388, 419.
Boethius, 14, 174.
Boodin, John E., 140, 324.
Bosanquet, B., 246, 324.
Boutroux, E., 325.
Bradley, F. H., 7, 246, 298, 324.
Brentano, F., 357.
Bridgman, P. W., 93 f.
Broad, C. D., 324.
Bruno, 388, 417, 448.
Büchner, Ludwig, 42, 71, 72, 97.
Buddha, 15, 182, 249 f., 388, 405.
Burke, Edmund, 8.

Cabanis, 97.
Calkins, M. W., 24.
Carlyle, Thomas, 246, 321, 325.
Chesterton, G. K., 4, 416.
Cicero, 428.
Clifford, W. K., 231.
Coleridge, S. T., 325, 388.
Comte, Auguste, 67, 133.
Confucius, 182, 447.
Copernicus, 38.
Cornford, F. M., 40.
Cousin, V., 174, 325, 428.
Croce, Benedetto, 246, 325.

Dante, 378, 388, 395, 415, 448.
Darwin, Charles, 54, 57, 81.
Democritus, 70.
Descartes, René, 70, 130, 132, 147, 195, 214, 221, 231 f., 238 f., 249, 253, 254, 266, 334, 426, 440.
Deussen, 378.
Dewey, John, 140, 143, 146, 155, 159, 167 f., 408.
Dionysius, The Pseudo-, 383, 388.
Drake, D., 324.
Driesch, Hans, 214, 229, 232.
Duns Scotus, 249.
Durant, W., 24.

Eaton, R. M., 130.
Eckhart, Meister, 388, 395, 403.
Eddington, A. S., 42.
Eleatics, The, 127.
Emerson, R. W., 246, 275, 325.
Enlightenment, The, 125, 184, 299.
Epictetus, 14, 246, 296, 298.
Epicurus, 85, 298.
Euclid, 134.

Fechner, G. T., 96.
Fénélon, 81.

Fichte, J. G., 21, 140, 146, 163, 243, 246, 248, 254, *284*, 298, 362 n.
Fiske, John, 42.
Fitzgerald, 117.
Francis of Assisi, 389, 405, 419.
Freud, S., Freudianism, 66, 235 n.
Fuller, B. A. G., 40.

Galileo, 38, 278.
Gentile, Giovanni, 246, 325.
Gorgias, 127 f.
Green, T. H., 246, 298, 324.

Haeckel, Ernst, 42, 46, 56, 69, 71, 72, 117.
Hamilton, Sir William, 174.
Hartmann, E. von, 15, 441 n.
Hegel, G. W. F., 246, 254, *285 f.*, 298, *316*, 325, 426, 431.
Henderson, L. J., 42, 115 f.
Heracleitus, 127, 219.
Herbart, J. F., 324.
Hippocrates, 37.
Hobbes, Thomas, 70, 96, 123, 132, 298.
Hobhouse, L. T., 57, 277.
Hodgson, Shadworth, 324.
Hoeffding, Harald, 246.
Hoernlé, R. F. A., 246 bis.
Holt, E. B., 324, 347, 349, 352, 365.
Howison, George H., 42, 246.
Hügel, F. von, 378.
Hume, David, 109 f., 127, 134, 195 f., 272, 357.
Husserl, Edmund, 357.
Huxley, Julian, 117.
Huxley, Thomas H., 42, 49, 69, 71, 72, 86 f., 117, 132, 135.

Jacobi, F. H., 184 f.
James, William, 21, 140, 143, 144, 146, 154, 157, 159, 228, 252, 324, 325, 332, 352, 355, 366, 378, 427.
Jelalu'd Din, 379.
Joan of Arc., 388, 409.
John (Gospel of), 387.
Johnson, Samuel, 332, 333.
Jones, Sir Henry, 246.
Jones, Rufus M., 378.

Kant, Immanuel, 78, 79, 110, *133 ff.*, 137, 140, *146 ff.*, 160, 165, 174, 185, 195 f., 221, 243, 246, 254, 265, 269, 275, 284, 295, 298, *310 ff.*, 388, 391, 395, 413, 426.
Kepler, J., 40.
Kropotkin, Peter, 299.

Lachelier, 325.
Ladd-Franklin, C., 271.
Laird, J., 324.
Lamennais, 126.
La Mettrie, 71.
Lao Tze, 249, 378, 382 ff., 404, 411.
Le Conte, Joseph, 42.
Le Roy, E., 174.
Lecky, W. E. H., 166.
Leibniz, Gottfried Wilhelm, 132, 241 f., 246, 250, 254, 266, 269.
Leuba, J., 378.
Lewes, G., 58.
Locke, John, 132, 248, 254, 331.
Lodge, Oliver, 42.
Loeb, Jacques, 55, 57.
Lotze, Hermann, 246, 280 f.
Lucretius, 42, 70, 85, 117.

McDougall, William, 61, 214, 229, 232.
Maimonides, 249.
Malebranche, N., 250.
Marett, R. R., 252.
Marx, Karl, 21.
Meinong, 357.
Mendelssohn, M., 428.
Mill, John Stuart, 68 n., 117, 152, 166, 174.
Miller, J. W., xi, 369.
Minkowski, 90.
Mohammed, 389.
Montaigne, Michel de, 129, 174, 298.
Montague, W. P., 140, 246, 324, 340.
Moore, G. E., 324.
Moore, J. S., 214.
Morgan, Lloyd, 57, 58 f., 277.
Muensterberg, Hugo, 288.
Mussolini, 144, 160, 169.

Needham, Joseph, 40, 155, 214.
Newman, Cardinal, 126.
NEWTON, ISAAC, 134, 280.
NICOLAS OF CUSA, 130, 388.
NIETZSCHE, FRIEDRICH, 42, 71, 84, 85, 117, 140, 144 f., 158.

OCCAM, WILLIAM of, 51.
Omar Khayyam, 84.
Orphism, 400.
Ostwald, Wilhelm, 42, 55, 71.

Paine, Thomas, 124.
Palmer, George Herbert, 87, 148.
PASCAL, BLAISE, 98, 121, 126.
Pasteur, 277.
Patrick, G. T. W., 24.
Paul, 387.
Paulsen, Friedrich, 24, 235.
Peirce, Charles, 140, 146, 152 ff., 196, 347.
Perry, Ralph Barton, 24, 42, 140, 246, 268, 324, 337, 349, 341, 358.
PHILO, 249, 428.
Planck, 90.
PLATO, 5, 84, 134, 174, 183, 214, *218 ff.*, 221, 232, 235, 237, 238, 246, 298, 324, 328, *344 f.*, 366, 387, 395, 396, 399, 400, 401 f., 408, 426, 431 f.
PLOTINUS, 371, 378, 379, 381, 387, 392 n., 395, 396 f., 399, 401, 406.
Pound, Roscoe, 159, 314.
Pratt, James Bissett, 140, 214, 232.
PROTAGORAS, 140.
PYRRHO, 127 f.
PYTHAGORAS, 124.

Quakers, 388.

Rand, B., 24.
REID, THOMAS, 324, 332, 334, 337, 341.
Renouvier, Charles, 325.
Riley, J. W., 324.
Robinson, D. S., 24.
Roentgen, 88.
Rogers, A. K., 24, 246, 324.
Romanes, G. J., 57, 69, 117.
ROUSSEAU, J. J., 34, 184.
Royce, Josiah, 140, 196 f., 246, 276, 279, 288, 298, *318*, 324, 325, 362 n., 448.
Ruggiero, 145.
RUSKIN, JOHN, 418.
Russell, Bertrand, 24, 42, 62, 73, 117, 200, 271, 324, 369.

Santayana, George, 24, 42, 73, 117, 169, 246, 324, 327, 357.
Scharnhorst, 393.
SCHELLING, FRIEDRICH WILHELM JOSEF, 174, 187, 246, 254, 284 f., 388, 448.
Schiller, F. C. S., 140, 146, 156.
SCHOPENHAUER, ARTHUR, 15, 137, 165, 174, 181, 186, 246, 265, 278, 298, 362 n., 441 n.
SCOTUS ERIGENA, 371, 388.
Sellars, R. W., 42, 59 f., 73.
SHAFTESBURY, 179, 298, 304.
SHAKESPEARE, 332.
Sheldon, Wilmon H., 24.
SILESIUS, 388.
SIMPLICIUS, 428.
Simpson, James Y., 40.
Sinclair, M., 246.
Singer, Ch., 37.
SOCRATES, 10, 38, 126, 129, 130, 298, 304, 373, 401, 413, 426, 431.
SOLON, 373.
Spaulding, E. G., 354.
SPENCER, HERBERT, 4 f., 30, 42, 45, 54, 55, 69, 71, 79 f., 85, 91, 117, 132, 136 f., 147, 152 f., 217, 278, 349, 392, 406, 426.
SPINOZA, BARUCH (BENEDICT), 77, 132, 163, 174, 184 f., 214, 236, 240, 241, 254, 298, 378, 388, 392, 441.
Stoicism, 14.
SUSO, H., 388.

Tagore, Devendranath, 378.
Tagore, Rabindranath, 378, 400.
Taine, H., 169.
TAULER, JOHANNES, 388.
THALES, 182, 219.
THOMAS AQUINAS, v. AQUINAS.
Tolstoi, Leo, 144, 332.
Trotzky, 62.
Tylor, E. B., 252.

Underhill, E., 378.

Vaihinger, Hans, 146.
Vedantism, 249.
Verworn, Max, 57.
Vigny, Alfred de, 305 n.
VOLTAIRE, 170.

Wahl, J., 324.
Ward, James, 42.
Whitehead, Alfred North, 40, 42, 240, 324 n., 333, 341, 360, 362 n.
Williams, Whiting, 144.
Wilm, E. C., 314.

XENOPHON, 38.

ZARATHUSTRA, 218.
ZENO (of Citium), 14.
ZENO (of Elea), 127 f.

SUBJECT INDEX

Parentheses indicate not synonyms but cognate or contrasted concepts under which, in general, other pertinent references may be found.

Absent Objects, 258–260, 268, 333 f.
Absolute, 133, 169, 221, 354 f., 366 f., 371–374, 396, 408, 434, 445.
Absolute Knowledge (Certainty, Relativity of Knowledge), 193, 443.
Abstraction, 192, 291, 365, 437.
Acquaintance (Immediate), 395.
Activity (Passivity), 227, 260, 262, 267, 269, 273 ff., 294, 339, 361 f., 370.
Aesthetics, v. Esthetics.
Agnosticism, 132 ff., 143.
Alternation, Principle of, 210, 415, 419 ff.
Altruism (Egoism, Sacrifice), 15, 186, 307.
Analysis, 167, 177, 180, 193, 327 f., 330, 348, 364, 367 f., 374.
Anger, 178.
Animism, 252.
Anti-intellectualism, 122.
Antinomy, 79.
Appearance (Reality), 10 f., 186, 251.
A priori (*a posteriori*), 90, 141, 142, 144, 165, 434.
Art, 35, 66 f., 169, 186 f., 202, 209, 400, 446.
Asceticism, 186, 304, 400, 407, 421.
Atheism, 394.
Atman (Self, Soul), 253.
Atom (Analysis, Simplicity), 88, 367.
Authority, 6, 9, 123, 126, 152.
Axiom (Certainty, Postulate), 110, 134, 302.

Beauty, 185 ff., 396, 399 f., 438.
Becoming (Change, Event, Being).
Beginning, 79 f.
Behaviorism, 68.
Belief, 3, 109, 137, 142, 150, 163, 171.
Benevolence (Altruism, Love), 308.
Bifurcation of Nature, 341, 344, 364 f.
Biology (as clew to philosophy), 141, 148, 155, 226 f., 247.
Body (Mind, Brain, Matter), 48, 97 ff., 223 ff., 234, 293, 351, 440 n.
Brahmanism, 15, 241, 249, 386, 407.
Brain (Body), 97 ff., 224 ff.
Buddhism, 15, 249.

Categorical Imperative, 151, 311 ff.
Categories, 135, 427.
Causality, 49, 78 f., 97, 103, 107 ff., 134 f., 188, 205, 226, 234, 278, 300, 309.
Cause *vs.* Reason, 102 f., 105, 121.
Certainty (Knowledge, Absolute, Dialectic, Axiom, Rationalism), 74, 121, 131 f., 151, 253, 437, 443.
Change, 16, 89, 127, 142, 157, 167, 189, 192 f., 198–201, 362, 443 f.
Changeless, -ness, 127, 168, 192 f., 201, 444.
Christianity, 86, 145, 160, 235, 249, 307, 331, 387.
Civilization, 87, 303, 316, 420.
Classification (Likeness, Difference), 191, 215.
Codes, 27, 410, 443.
Coincidence of Extremes, 384.
Common Sense, 68, 196, 259, 311,

333 f., 339, 343, 347 f., 357, 359, 360.
Communication, 211, 276, 290, 309.
Concept, -ion (Percept, Idea, Intellect, Universal), 191, 197, 200.
Configuration (Form), 105 f., 112 ff.
Conscience, 147, 292, 412 f.
Consciousness, 54, 55 f., 57, 63, 70, 217, 448.
Conservation of energy, 89, 224 f., 232.
Conservation of value, 33.
Consistency, 157, 162 f., 426 f., 429, 431.
Contemplation, 408, 416.
Continuity (Infinite), 89, 198 ff., 444.
Conventions, 317.
Conversation, 7.
Cosmological Argument, 30, 31, 75, 78, 281.
Courage, 413.
Creation, 79, 80.
Creativity, 205, 273, 291, 331, 338 f., 340, 450.
Creed, 27, 123.
Crime and Punishment, 101, 309.
Curiosity, 230.

Death, 27, 32, 48, 296 f.
Deduction (Logic, Rationalism, Induction), 166.
Democracy, 124, 160.
Desire, 148 f., 234, 317.
Destiny (Death, Immortality), 295, 436, 449.
Determinism (Freedom, Law, Causality), 188, 226.
Devil, 218.
Dialectic, 129, 131, 164 f., 183, 197, 276, 286, 300, 316, 431 f., 437, 446.
Difference (Likeness), 329, 403.
Discipline, 84.
Divine, 28, 30 ff.
Dogma, 182, 315.
Dream, 30, 273 f., 343, 346.
Dualism, chs. XVI–XVIII; 13, 206, 330.
Duration (Time), 204.
Duty (Ethics, Obligation), 15, 321, 436.

Eclecticism, 23, 428 ff.
Ecstasy (Vision), 397.
Education, 303, 305.
Efficient Cause, 106.
Ego-centric predicament, 268.
Egoism (Altruism), 15, 299, 302, 313.
Elan vital, 190.
Emergent Evolution, 57 f., 112 ff., 277, 364.
Empiricism (Experience, Rationalism), 18, 133 f., 143, 150, 156, 193, 208, 300, 328, 432, 439 f.
Endocrine glands, 61 f., 101.
Ends (Means), 228, 299 f., 309, 311, 312, 315.
Energism, 44.
Energy, 30, 56, 89, 217, 224, 278.
Entelechy, 232.
Enthusiasm, 35, 66, 387.
Epiphenomenon, 236.
Epistemology (Knowledge), 19.
Equality, 308, 311.
Error, 343, 346, 363.
Essence (Universal), 220, 365 ff., 434.
Esthetics, 19, 147, 186, 303.
Eternal, Eternity, 87, 220, 449.
Ethics (Morality, Duty, Good, Evil Values), 13 f., 33, 83, 151, 165, 234, 295, 298 ff., 372, 410; Chs. V, XXVI.
Event (Change), 91.
Evil, 33, 81, 210, 217 f., 238 f., 353, 371, 372 ff., 391, 395, 400, 439 f., 446.
Evolution (Emergent Evolution), 51, 71, 112 ff., 147, 155, 296, 412 f.
Experience (Empiricism, Intuition), 18, 25, 133, 147, 208, 217, 233, 259, 267 f., 271, 299, 319, 362, 395, 427, 446.
Experimentalism, 143 f., 168, 316, 432, 443, 445.
Explanation, 67, 94, 95, 97, 105, 215, 248.
Exploitation, 311, 316.

Externality (Objectivity), 257, 259, 264.
External Relations, 351, 368.

Fact, 99, 105, 442.
Faith, 183.
Fatalism (Freedom, Determinism), 185.
Fear, 178, 252.
Feeling, ch. XI; 31, 33, 56, 157.
Final Causes (Teleology, Purpose), 80, 106 ff.
Form (Configuration), 112, 135, 237.
Fraternity, 306 ff., 331.
Freedom (Determinism), 45 f., 149, 184, 185, 205, 294, 316, 379, 417, 442, 450.
Friendship, 210, 419.

Genius, 211, 418.
Geometry, 134.
Given, The, 106.
Glands, endocrine, 61 f., 101.
God, 28, 29, 36, 48, 68, 74 ff., 144, 150, 152, 170, 185 f., 238, 241, 261, 266 f., 275, 281, 291, 300, 330, 346, 379, 392, 394 f., 421, 448.
Golden Rule, 314.
Good, 221, 238, 372, 392, 403 f., 405 f., 445.
Good, Highest (*Summum Bonum*), 319.

Habit, 154, 206, 295.
Happiness, 84, 85, 149, 159, 306, 320, 373, 411, 435.
Heredity, 82, 148, 294, 306.
History, 205, 413, 444.
Holy, 35, 149.
Honor, 304 f., 312, 413.
Humanism, 156, 372, 420, 449.
Humanity, 69.
Hypothesis (Scientific Method), 143, 166, 282, 443.
Hypothetical Imperative, 310.

Idea, 64, 152, 154, 219 f., 230, 248, 258, 337, 344 f., 434.
Idealism, chs. XIX-XXVI; 12, 236, 242, 325, 326 f., 332 f., 336, 348 f., 362 n., 375, 380, 407, 421, 426, 437.
Illusion (Appearance), 248, 251, 258 ff., 262, 338, 343, 346, 372.
Imagination, 65, 187, 286, 294, 418.
Imitation, perfect, 162.
Immediate, 185, 193, 389, 395, 442.
Immortality (Destiny), 29, 45, 68, 149 f., 160, 297, 387, 450.
Imputation (Postulate), 109 ff.
Inaccessible, The, 171, 203.
Incarnation, 286.
Independence (objectivity), 161, 221, 225, 237, 248, 262, 311, 330, 343 f., 351, 356, 361 n., 416.
Indifference (Neutral Object), 128.
Individual, 318, 446.
Induction, 18, 209, 432, 433, 434.
Ineffable, 382, 384, 388, 390 ff., 406 f.
Infinity, 77, 80, 99, 114, 149, 199, 254, 286, 366, 448.
Innate Ideas, 289.
Instinct, 33, 61, 81, 148, 177, 180 f., 229, 295, 298, 307, 449.
Institutions, 317.
Instrumentalism, 155, 167, 445.
Intellect (Reason, Knowledge, Concept, Intuition), 178, 190 ff., 208 ff., 312.
Interaction (ism), 223, 226 ff.
Interest (Desire, Will), 191.
Internal Relations, 351, 368.
Intuition, 9, 17, 68, 249, 251 ff., 267, 291, 307, 319, 332 f., 358 f., 360, 380, 384, 412 f., 435, 442.
Intuition, acquired, 208 f.
Intuitionism, chs. XI–XV; 382 n., 446.
Irony (Socratic), 129.
Irrational, 307.

Judaism, 250.
Judgment, 131 f., 137, 170, 270, 335, 362.
Justice, 150, 210, 308, 311, 411.

Karma, 448.
Knowledge (Epistemology, Absolute, Intellect, Reason, Anal-

ysis), chs. VIII–XV; 19, 177, 185, 208 ff., 334, 338 f., 352, 363, 380, 395, 407, 416.

Labor, 284.
Language, 176, 317.
Laughter, 179.
Law, 105, 206, 210, 216, 280, 314, 317, 444.
Life, 52, 55, 189, 204 f., 247.
Likeness (Difference, Relation, Genus, Class), 191, 215.
Logic, 19, 164, 336, 345, 445.
Logic in ethics, 312.
Logos, 219.
Lost trace, 161.
Love (Altruism, Fraternity), 86, 307, 315, 396, 406, 418, 438.
Loyalty, 27, 318.

Machine (Mechanism, Organism), 108, 227.
Magic, 27.
Mana, 30.
Management, 63, 101, 309, 380.
Mass, 89.
Materialism, 12, 43 f., 68, 70, 91 f., 96, 216, 219, 235, 272, 273.
Mathematics, 131 f., 134.
Matter (Substance), 89, 207, 221, 239 f., 257 f.
Meaning (Value, Purpose, Sign), 99, 110 f., 152 ff., 176, 225, 229, 285, 296, 327, 436 ff.
Means (End), 112.
Mechanics, 131.
Mechanism, 188, 205 f., 229.
Memory, 204, 264, 352.
Mental energy, 56.
Mental tests, 209.
Metaphysics, 10, 92, 94, 143, 300.
Metaphysics and ethics, 150, 298 ff.
Mind, 47, 52 ff., 63, 70, 93, 96 ff., 219, 221, 227, 234, 239 f., 254, 264, 287, 327, 351, 353, 369, 370, 392, 448.
Miracle, 36.
Misology, 125.
Monads, 266, 269.
Monism, 226, 236, 280, 330, 336, 371, 379 ff., 384, 420.
Moral conditions of truth, 385, 417 f.
Moral value, 100.
Morale, 165.
Motion, 70, 89, 96, 128, 189, 199, 216.
Multiconsistent universe, 162 f.
Murder, 313.
Mutations, 58.
Mysteries, The, 386.
Mystic, Mysticism, chs. XXX–XXXIII; 314, 372, 437, 440, 445, 447.
Myth, 27, 145.

Naturalism, chs. III–VII; 12, 39, 121, 124, 136, 152, 188, 208, 247, 270, 273, 292, 334, 335, 340, 343, 374, 375, 400, 437, 448.
Nature, ch. XXIV; 11, 43, 78, 84, 148, 207, 241, 248, 279, 295, 298, 301, 304, 325, 331, 392, 399, 448.
Negative Path, 401 ff., 416.
Neo-Realism, ch. XXVIII; 335.
Neo-vitalism, 226 f.
Neutral entities, 352, 368, 376, 391, 398.
Nirvana, 407.
Non-assertion, 384, 411.
Non-ego (not-self, externality, Objectivity).
Norm, 301.
Number, 128.

Objective Idealism, ch. XXIII; 360, 362.
Objectivity (Externality, Non-ego), 77, 290, 347, 360, 380.
Obligation (Duty, Ought), 28, 35, 301, 321, 436.
Ontological argument, 76, 78.
Optimism, 153, 327, 439.
Organism, 112, 186, 190, 227, 351.
Originality, 228, 409, 412, 417, 429.
Orthodoxy, 326.
Other Minds (Solipsism), 266 f., 270, 288 f.
Ought (Obligation), 302.

Pain (Pleasure).
Paradox, 128, 254, 286, 334, 383.
Parallelism, 223 ff.
Parsimony, Law of, 51.
Passivity (Activity).
Patriotism, 303, 411.
Perception (Sensation), 185, 189, 195, 274, 337 ff.
Perfection, 77, 149, 220, 317.
Permanence (Change, Changeless, Substance), 127.
Personality, 137, 223, 287, 297, 305, 310, 315, 320, 392, 403.
Pessimism, 15.
Philosophy, 3, 325, 329.
Physics, 73, 88, 134, 188.
Pleasure (Sensation, Quality, Happiness), 85, 100, 166, 373.
Pluralism (Monism, Dualism), 217, 265, 330, 351, 368, 420, 426.
Poet, Poetry, 209, 328.
Positivism, 44, 67, 92 f.
Possibility (Probability), 74, 111, 114, 115, 149, 297.
Postulate, 109 ff., 149.
Poverty, 405.
Power, 28, 137, 150, 217, 416, 417.
Pragmatism, chs. IX, X; 18, 138, 191, 308, 328, 355, 445, 450.
Pragmatism, Negative, 164.
Prayer, 27, 45, 252, 402, 407.
Prejudice, 6, 8, 17.
Primitive thought, 25, 122 f.
Probability (Induction, Certainty), 109, 443, 445.
Prophet, 182, 209, 312, 412.
Prostitution, 312.
Providence, 36.
Psycho-analysis, 235 n.
Psychology, 19, 60 ff., 69, 104, 177, 184, 206, 209, 299, 309, 440 n., 441.
Purpose (Meaning, Final Cause, Teleology), 46, 107 ff., 227.

Qualities, Primary and Secondary, 257 f., 341, 364.
Quality (Value), 31, 94, 100, 166, 299, 373, 418, 420.
Quanta, Quantum Theory, 90.
Quantity, 105 f., 111.

Rationalism, 18, 122 ff., 131 ff., 134, 142, 184 f., 193, 330, 388, 446.
Realism, chs. XXVII–XXIX; 73, 264, 381, 399, 417, 419, 421, 445 f.
Realism in art and politics, 327.
Reality (Metaphysics), 46 f., 77, 148, 170, 186, 216, 249, 259, 330, 383, 392, 403.
Realization, 403, 407.
Reason (Intellect, Logic, Knowledge), 9, 18, 70, 131, 150, 184, 212, 215, 219, 312, 317 f., 330, 371, 379, 431.
Recreation, 420.
Reflex Arc, 61.
Regulative Ideas, 395.
Relations (see External and Internal), 350.
Relativity (Physics), 91.
Relativity of Knowledge (Agnosticism, Positivism), 80, 133, 158, 191.
Religion, 26, 63, 136, 151, 169, 238, 249, 253 f., 407.
Respect, 303, 305, 308, 309.
Rest (Motion).
Revelation, 33, 123.
Ridicule, Test of, 179.
Right (Duty, Ethics, Law), 301, 319.
Risk, 158.
Rite, Ritual, 27, 153 f.

Sacrifice (Altruism), 307, 309, 312.
Scepticism, ch. VIII; 126, 430.
Science, 49, 131, 191.
Scientific Method, 49, 131 ff., 151, 166, 349, 417, 443 f.
Self (Soul, Mind, Ego, Personality), 52, 188, 193, 223, 253, 270, 317, 359, 370, 384, 407, 430, 440 f., 444.
Self-consciousness, 98, 195 ff., 253, 285, 294, 347.
Self-expression, 84, 302, 317, 318, 435.
Sensation, 70, 127, 231, 270, 291, 319, 334, 349, 401, 419.
Senses (as sources of knowledge), 127, 131 f., 220.

Sign (Symbol, Meaning), 197.
Simplicity (Complexity), 157, 190, 209, 349 f., 369, 370, 376.
Slavery, 311.
Social ethics, 165, 302, 307.
Social pragmatism, 159.
Society, 31, 65, 289, 419.
Solipsism, 266, 267, 288.
Sophistry, 125 ff.
Soul (Self), 27, 29, 45, 237.
Space, 6, 90, 98, 135, 216, 255, 267, 289 f.
Speculation, 29, 30, 232, 285, 299.
Spiritualism, ch. II; 65.
Stoicism, 14.
Strife, 217 f., 243.
Subconscious, 56, 440 n.
Subjective Idealism, ch. XXII; 340.
Subjective Revelation, 253.
Subjectivity, 96, 163, 347.
Sublimation, 235.
Subsistence, 344, 365.
Substance, 12 f., 216, 249, 257 f., 330, 331, 341, 441.
Supernature, Supernaturalism, 27, 51, 142, 159, 421.
Symbol (Sign), 155.
Sympathy, 179, 190, 293, 382 f.

Tao, 238 f., 411.
Teleological proof, 75, 80, 438 f.
Teleology (Purpose, Final Cause), ch. VII; 164, 186, 278, 282, 296.
That and What, 211, 393 f., 444.
Theft, 313.
Theism, 394.
Things *vs.* Persons, 310.
Time, 80, 90, 99, 135, 188, 204, 217, 239, 374.
Toleration, 429 f.
Tradition, 7, 66, 124.
Tragedy, 439.
Truth, 102 ff., 125, 142, 145, 154 ff., 162 f., 168 f., 211.
Truthfulness, 313, 319, 419.
Types, 20, 22, 425, 427.

Unfinished, The, 171, 242.
Uniqueness, 194, 211, 329, 435.
Unity (monism), 36, 193, 215, 329, 350, 371, 414, 441.
Universal (Idea, Concept, Particular), 286, 343, 365 f., 375, 435.
Unknowable, The, 136.
Utilitarianism, 152.

Values, 19, 28, 33, 100, 111 f., 296, 299, 308, 315, 320, 397, 416, 442, 450.
Vanity, 304.
Vedantism, 249.
Verification, 156, 166.
Virtues, 404, 411.
Vision (Intuition), 182 f., 220.
Vision, Beatific, 395, 397, 399, 401, 406, 414.
Vision, Theory of, 255 ff.
Voluntarism (Pragmatism), 143.

Wage-relation, 311.
Whole, knowledge of, 5, 180, 185, 202, 208, 211.
Will, 141, 177, 183, 231, 287, 362.
Will to Believe, 171.
Will to Live, 181.
Will to Power, 181, 320.
Wisdom, 212.
Wit, 179.
Worship, 210, 407, 419.

Yang and Yin, 217.
Yoga, 407.

Creation - p51

p.22 - criticism of Hegel

Russia - Holy Water :- 38

Dalai Lama - 45

area - p53

Kant - 148-150

plato - idea - 220

human nature - 308 - before of

19
41
27
88

16
10
27
41
94

Freud
Society

43 - conscious
only value
148 - conscience
call of the whole
2 it part.

180 ff Bergson
348 ff - 9 ~~[illegible]~~ - neo Radian